SEPTEMBER 1952 PRICE 1s. 6d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A., D.D.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—Barth and Brunner—The Church in the New Social Order—Unity of the Word and Sacrament—Hibbert Journal Jubilee—Two Stages in the Christian Life—The Edict of Milan—Advice to a Young Minister 357

II. MOTIVES FOR GOODNESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the Reverend C. Leslie Mitton, Ph.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham 360

III. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 364
2. The Christian Year 366

IV. LITERATURE 373

V. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., B.Litt., The University, Manchester 378

VI. PHILO AND THE FOURTH GOSPEL. By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Oxford 385

VII. ENTRE NOUS—Worship in the Day School: 2. The Material of Worship—Modern Education 386

VIII. TITLE PAGE AND CONTENTS TO VOLUME THE SIXTY-THIRD.

VOLUME LXIII. No. 12

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH

EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES. KING'S GATE. ABERDEEN

The Expository Times

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS

This month's issue completes Vol. LXIII. Binding Case for this Volume will be ready later; price 2s. 9d. (postage 4d.).

Subscribers who cannot get their copies cased locally may send them to us for attention.

Subscriptions for Vol. LXIV, which begins with the October Number, should now be sent in. The rate is 19s. 6d. (postage included).

Complete Volumes in Cloth Binding
pre-1940 (if still in print) 15s. each.
1940–1950 17s. each.
Index Volume to Vols. I–XX (1889–1909) 7s.

'Keeps its high standard.'
Aberdeen Press and Journal.

'This excellent monthly.'
Australian Christian World.

38 GEORGE STREET EDINBURGH 2 **T. & T. CLARK**

IMPORTANT NEWS FROM THE R.E.P.

NEW VOLUME NOW READY IN THE POPULAR TEACHERS' GUIDES TO THE AGREED SYLLABUSES FOR SECONDARY AND GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

JESUS AND HIS TEACHING

By Norman J. Bull, M.A.

Lecturer in Divinity, St. Luke's College, Exeter.

Sixteen full chapters that cover the life of our Lord and expound His teaching as exemplified in His life.

A comprehensive study-book for the teacher, with notes on lesson presentation, and suggestions for practical class work.

'It makes clear not only that the Teaching of Jesus was unique, but that it is inseparable from His Person and from the way in which He fully exemplified it in all His deeds and relationships.'—*Dr. Basil Yeaxlee.*

Vol. 5. in the Secondary section of the Teacher's Guides. The lay-out of the text matter has been revised, providing guidance in studying the material, suggesting possible ways of handling it and showing how the pupils can co-operate.

With maps and time charts, and good index.

Cloth boards, price 7s. 6d. net (postage 3d.)

Fourteen other Guides are available, in four grades, now all in print again. Ask for full list.

RELIGION IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS

A Valuable Survey

By Dr. Basil Yeaxlee

Historical review and study of possibilities of Christian Teaching in the Day School.

'Dr. Basil Yeaxlee, a distinguished educationalist has given us a brilliant survey of religion in our schools. To have done so in thirty pages is high testimony to his expert knowledge and even more his quite remarkable powers of brief exposition. . . . On the conditions of the success of the 1944 Act he warns his readers that much depends upon (*a*) the quality and the practical teachability of the Agreed Syllabus, and (*b*) the number and competence of the teachers willing to teach in accordance with them. On both factors Dr. Yeaxlee has some profound and practical comments. This excellent booklet is surely a "must" for any intelligent person interested in this vital subject.'
Free Church Chronicle.

Price 1s. net (postage 2d.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS LTD.
Wallington Surrey

The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God
A Study in the Theology of John Calvin

by T. H. L. PARKER, M.A., B.D.

"This survey of the Reformer's doctrine of Revelation, with its excellent documentation and its wide learning, is much to be welcomed. It is of great topical interest, in view of the controversy in contemporary continental theology on the question of natural theology."—*Church Times.*

Demy 8vo. 128 pages. 10/6 net.

Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude

by W. A. WHITEHOUSE B.LITT., M.A.

Mr. Whitehouse, a Cambridge mathematician and an Oxford theologian, sets forth, with great lucidity and candour, the main contentions of the scientist and of Christian faith. The discussion is carried out in a style that is remarkably clear and easy to follow and makes an equal appeal to the academic and the popular mind.

Demy 8vo. *Ready soon.* 154 pages. 12/6 net.

OLIVER AND BOYD
Tweeddale Court, Edinburgh

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your PRINTING and PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.
PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS
TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.
LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS
EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

BARTH and Brunner are still 'required reading.' For nearly thirty years now they have been giant figures in the theological scene, and they are still able to inspire loyalties and provoke hotly contested arguments. This magazine was among the first in Britain to call attention to the fact that in Barth a new star of the first magnitude had appeared in the theological universe, and Barth could never be mentioned without Brunner. The late H. R. Mackintosh, for example, did not hesitate to say that 'in Barth we have incontestably the greatest figure in Christian theology that has appeared for decades,' while T. F. TORRANCE, writing only this year in the 'Scottish Journal of Theology', refers to Barth as 'a great modern Athanasius.'

Perhaps most of us have felt ourselves more at home with Brunner than with Barth, if only because all along Brunner has been less uncompromising. While Barth maintained that the 'imago Dei' in man had been totally lost and obliterated by sin, Brunner contended that it is still represented in the sinful by their humanity and personality. The argument between them on this point and on others still goes on, but it may well be maintained that, whether we may differ from either or both of them, they have succeeded in making any theology likely to find acceptance to-day essentially a *Biblical* theology. And this is assuredly a clear gain.

Brunner has always cast his net widely, and he has not hesitated to pronounce on many of the questions agitating the mind of man to-day. It was therefore a fortunate circumstance that the Free Church Federal Council was able to get his acceptance to speak at its Congress this year on *The Church in the New Social Order*.[1] He begins by pointing out that as a non-Britisher he may see our problems all the more objectively, and the first question he asks is, Does any given social order affect and interest the Church at all? His response comes quickly enough. 'It is not the primary, not the essential, task of the Church to create, to change, to improve the social order. The task of the Church lies beyond any social order, because its task is to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Kingdom of God which transcends all social orders, the good and the bad alike. The immediate, primary task of the Church is not to preach and to fight for a social programme, but to preach the message of redemption and eternal life.'

He points out that the shift of emphasis that took place in the Church when it became concerned to improve social conditions, largely because of Marx's jibe that religion was the opium of the people, was dangerous because it implied a major change in the interpretation of the gospel. 'The Kingdom of God is not at all something which man can create. It is the new life, the new condition of mankind, which God alone can bring about; something that comes from beyond man's own doing and striving.' He maintains that the Ekklesia of the New Testament, which is to be understood as the present and experienced form of the Kingdom of God, is not an order, either a social order or a church order. 'The Ekklesia is something exclusively personal, consisting of the Person of Christ and the persons of the believers who, by faith, are in Christ.' He insists that this means no return to the pietistic, individualistic conception of the gospel. 'The New Testament idea of the Ekklesia is not only the most personal, it is also the most social, or better the most communal thing. It is more social than any Socialism, it is more communal than any Communism. Socialism and Communism, even in their highest possible form, are orders, and, for that reason, they are of this world.'

But while the Church's task has not changed, every social order presents a specific challenge, and he goes on to deal with the demands of the new age in Britain. He feels that the task of the Church is made at once easier and more difficult, easier, he suggests, because social resentments have largely gone, more difficult because there is now a pronounced tendency to depersonalization. 'Man does not need a Saviour-God any more, because by

[1] S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net.

means of the State he can work out salvation for himself.' He inserts a warning against further structural changes in the line of further socialization, stating that these must end in the Totalitarian State.

The challenge that the new order in Britain makes to the Church is that it should provide, or help to provide, what he calls personalization and communalization. Particularly the Church should personalize and communalize the preaching of the Word of God. 'Both the Church and theology are about to discover a double fact: the sociological meaning of the Word and the theological meaning of community; or, to put it in one concept, the unity of the Word and Sacrament.' Here he reaches the core of his argument, and what he says repays close and repeated study. By a line all his own he reaches a position that is increasingly being held in our own land to-day. Any summary is inadequate, but here are some points he stresses.

Faith in God through Christ means that man ceases to be an individual centred upon his self-interest. Faith is what we might call communal existence. 'Is it not what the New Testament calls Ekklesia?' So to the Sacraments. 'Sacramental existence is the same thing as communal existence through communion with Christ who is the Spirit.' 'Word and Sacrament not only *belong* together: Word and Sacrament *are* one and the same thing, namely, God's action by which He makes men one with Him and one with one another, through the gift of His Son and of His Spirit.' He is right in pointing out that many go to church to receive the Word of God individually, and to the church also to receive the Sacrament individually. This individualistic approach is inadequate. 'Our theologies have always emphasized the transforming character of the Word and of the Sacrament; but they failed to emphasize that this transformation is essentially the transformation of an individual into a member of the Body of Christ.' The Reformers, he points out, were right in denying that the Sacrament is the transformation of the elements into the Body of Christ, but they should have emphasized that the Sacrament *is* a transformation, not of the elements, but of the persons who eat and drink, into the Body of Christ.

What it all comes finally to mean is the rediscovery of sacramental existence, and how this has to be worked out provides a fascinating subject. Brunner has taken us as far as it is possible to go within the limits of a lecture, but he has provided in small compass enough for us to see that his widely ranging mind has lost nothing of its penetration and its power.

The current number of *The Hibbert Journal* is of quite exceptional interest. It is the Jubilee Number of the journal and contains a selection of articles from the fifty years of its existence. There are articles by William James, Leo Tolstoy, G. K. Chesterton, Kirsopp Lake, Sir Oliver Lodge, Aldous Huxley, W. R. Inge, and L. P. Jacks—a galaxy of talent of which any journal might well be proud. The article by Kirsopp Lake is of intense interest and of very real importance. Its title is 'Jesus.' The central doctrine of orthodox Christianity is the doctrine of the Incarnation. Now that doctrine springs entirely from the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptic Gospels teach rather a doctrine of apotheosis; they tell of a man who became God; whereas the Fourth Gospel tells of the God who became man. Kirsopp Lake therefore holds that the doctrine of the Incarnation comes neither from Jesus Himself nor from those who were in direct touch with Him. If then we are to rethink the question of who Jesus was, what is to be our line of approach? Kirsopp Lake sees for the future two possible attitudes. First, there is the Fundamentalist attitude. For it the Bible 'is God's word written.' If so, it is infallible and not subject to criticism. 'Therefore if the Bible says that Jesus was the Incarnate Logos the matter is settled.' The Bible *does* say so, therefore, if the Fundamentalist attitude prevails 'argument is at an end.' Second, there is the 'Experimentalist' position. This attitude 'will not require as a condition of (church) membership that we should accept any opinion about Jesus, even His own.' It will simply regard with interest 'the possibilities which a critical study of the documents suggests.' What then are the possibilities? Kirsopp Lake lists five. (1) He was a prophet. (2) He was the Davidic Messiah. (3) He was the Son of Man who would come at the end of the world to judge the living and the dead. (4) He was Lord of a Sacramental Cult which conferred Regeneration and Life through its Sacraments. (5) He was the Incarnate Logos. Now the second and the third of these can be covered by the content of the word Messiah. Kirsopp Lake regards the whole connexion of ideas which gather round this word as completely Jewish and completely temporary. 'Therefore I think,' he says, 'that the religious minds of the future will probably pay the same kind of disinterested attention to the "Messianic" question as they will to the details of Homeric theology.' The value of Jesus no more depends on this idea than does the beauty of Homer on the belief in Zeus. The Sacramental approach belongs to the Greco-Oriental cults and would reduce Jesus to myth rather than to history. The Logos conception 'belongs to a general form of thought which is alien to to-day.' True, one educated in Greek

philosophy can still assimilate it but it is largely irrelevant. There remains the conception that Jesus is a prophet, who is a man, whose power, as it seems to himself, comes from without. The true prophet is controlled from the right source; the false prophet is inspired from the wrong source. The test of a prophet is the application of reason to his message. 'A society which has no prophets perishes from inanition, while, if it has nothing else, it dies from convulsions. The condition of health is when prophets supply the energy and the vision, while men of reason direct and control it.' The Experimentalist will rank Jesus as a great prophet. He will recognize that sometimes He was wrong, as in His eschatological teaching, and that sometimes He is impossible as in His teaching regarding poverty. The teaching of Jesus must be set and interpreted in the light of its own century; then it will become a guide and an inspiration, but never an automatic key. One may not agree with Kirsopp LAKE; at least he compels his readers to think.

In *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review* Dr. C. Leslie MITTON writes on 'Two Stages in the Christian Life.' He starts from the religious experience of John Wesley. Wesley was never hostile to Christianity. Wesley's first stage was a time when he seriously and honestly tried to serve God but had only a struggle without peace or joy. Until he met the Moravians, who had both peace and joy, this battle *was* to him Christianity. Now he saw that something was wrong. Almost in despair, and almost at breaking-point, he cast himself on God as he was; and then the peace and joy which he had never experienced flooded in; and that was the second stage. At both stages the goal was the same; but the method was different. In the first stage he set himself the task of being a Christian. In the second self-confidence was gone and he abandoned himself to God. But the first stage was not a bad thing. It is good as far as it goes, for it makes a man realize his need of the second stage. It was a schoolmaster to bring him to Christ. Now Dr. MITTON finds these two stages everywhere. The Old Testament covenant idea represents the first stage. The covenant can only be maintained by man's obedience to God and that obedience, however hard man's struggle, cannot be effectively and consistently given. It is the difference between John the Baptist and Jesus. John summoned men to an act of the will towards repentance—an act which can never get beyond struggle—Jesus summoned them to a surrender and a peace. It is the meaning of Pentecost. The disciples are told to wait for the Spirit, because devotion by itself can never be enough. There must be added the power which is not man's power. The two stages are, of course, crystal clear in Paul's life. Even in the first stage Paul was an intensely religious man; but only in the surrendered second stage was he a man at peace. Our modern tendency to look at Jesus as an ideal to whom we aspire is the first stage religion. Our substitution of the word *decision* for *conversion* is symptomatic of the first stage religion. The great danger is to limit religion to a thing of moral endeavour, to become 'tired, well-meaning Christians, living on their nerves,' instead of a people 'equipped with the Holy Spirit,' who depend, not on their own efforts, however sincere and intense, but on 'the exceeding greatness of God's power towards us.'

In *The Church Quarterly Review* John BLIGH, S.J., writes on 'The "Edict of Milan": Curse or Blessing?' By that Edict Constantine granted to men for the first time 'liberty to follow either the religion of the Christians or any other cult which of his own free choice he has thought to be best adapted for himself.' It is easy to argue that by this Edict the Church lost more than it gained in that it became so bound to the State as to lose its independence and to suffer all the degeneration of a State Church. Mr. BLIGH has some timely reminders that persecution is by no means the blessing it is often argued to be. Persecution has its own evils. It produces the problem of the lapsed and of those who sought safety instead of death. Martyrdom did not always propagate the faith. In Persia and North Africa there were martyrs in plenty, but the Church was obliterated. Persecution has often been the parent of schism, for the rigorists have always split from the orthodox in their treatment of those who did not choose death. Persecution very naturally deterred people from entering the Church. Persecution inevitably hindered the Church in her preaching, teaching, and worshipping task. But Mr. BLIGH decides, in spite of all, that the official favour of imperial converts was far better than a precarious liberty with the threat of persecution never absent. The greatest danger of toleration was the interference of the Emperors. It is true that Constantine sought the unity of the Church, but it is also true that he sought that unity, at least in part, for political ends. The Emperors sought to rule the Church, as it were *ex officio*, as well as the State. When Athanasius protested the Emperor returned, 'What I say is a canon!' Justinian saw himself as a 'living law sent by God to man.' Constantine declared himself to be 'inspired by Almighty God' to tell the Church what to believe. When the Church became a State Church the bishops became the new aristocracy. The question arose, Can the

civil power be used to crush heretics? Into a State Church there came converts not by choice, but rather by inertia. But the fact remains that had the Church not been the Church of the State, the break up of the Empire would have been the break up of the Church, but from her very position the Church was able to receive and Christianize the barbarian hordes and, as Christopher Dawson writes, 'As the darkness deepened over Western Europe it was in the monasteries rather than in the cities that the traditions of Latin culture and the patterns of Christian life were preserved.' This article is documented in the most scholarly way.

In *The Congregational Quarterly* Dr. Geoffrey F. NUTTALL in an article, 'Advice to a Young Minister,' publishes with notes a hitherto unpublished letter from Richard Baxter to Abraham Pinchbecke who was taking up duty in the parish of Mashbury in Essex. The advice is still most excellent advice and we quote some selections from it. 'Still look to your ends . . . the glory of the Redeemer, the winning and the saving of souls . . . and watch against the encroachment and mixture of any other ends. . . . Let your right go when by so doing you are likely to further their salvation. . . . Fear not oft repeating the same things, so you handsomely diversify in method and terms. . . . Drive home every truth to resolution and practice. . . . Pray for your people as well as study for them. . . . To weep over them sometimes will do more than to speak to them.' Certain resolutions of Baxter's own are offered. 'To study well the certainty and greatness of the misery of my hearers, till my heart be moved with compassion and can deal with them as men cast overboard and ready to perish.' 'In preaching and private dealing, be sure to manifest as much love to your hearers as you can. Preach rather with tender, melting affection than with anger and disdain. . . . Take all opportunities to be with them in their afflictions. . . . And for your carriage to your neighbour ministers, I advise you that you further the work of unity and association with all your interest and power. Do as little of God's work dividedly as you can. . . . In a word be a faithful and importunate suitor for Christ in the whole course of your ministry.' There is no parish minister in all the country who would not do well to read this letter every week.

Motives for Goodness in the New Testament

BY THE REVEREND C. LESLIE MITTON, PH.D., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM

To produce goodness in human life is one of the primary concerns of our Christian Faith. If we shrink from listing it as the first interest of our Faith, at any rate we are bound to admit that anything else of value in it—Belief in God, Reconciliation to God, Worship, Service—is shown to be unreal and empty unless it is attested by fruits of Christlikeness. 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' is the test our Lord Himself applied.

The Christian Faith was not the first movement to insist on the importance of goodness, but none has set higher store by it. Moreover the quality of goodness required of Christians was such as to appear startlingly new, and incredibly high. But even more remarkable in the early days of the Christian Church than the high standard set, was the amazingly high level of attainment by ordinary people in their daily practice. The impact of Christianity upon the world consisted not only in the new thoughts of God it brought, and in the certainty of His approach to men in Christ, but also in the new quality of life which this new Faith brought into being, and which we now speak of as goodness, or Christlikeness.

Some writers have been at pains to show that there is comparatively little which is quite new in the moral standards and teachings of Christianity. Parallels to this or that item of instruction have been found in Rabbinic literature and Stoic writings. But even if some features are known elsewhere, there can be no doubt that the moral teaching of Jesus, taken as a whole, came upon the world as something new and breath-taking—not only in what it asked, but also in what it achieved in the lives of the early Christians.

In a society where sexual indulgence and even gross vice was not even disapproved, the Christian stood for chastity before marriage and complete faithfulness within marriage. Where racial and class antagonisms held men apart, the Christian would not recognize any barriers to friendship. He sought the welfare of all men, not only his friends, but unknown strangers, and even enemies. Forgiveness and kindliness marked his conduct where men expected vengeance and hate. Love, honesty, hard work, generosity characterized his life. Womanhood and child life were treated with a new respect. In times of plague and disaster, when others fled for safety, the Christian was found to risk his health and life itself in giving help to

others. It was this practical goodness which attested to practical-minded men and women the truth of the Faith which the Christians proclaimed.

Whatever else Christianity brought into the world, it certainly brought a sublime ethic. It also brought some powerful driving force, able to make this ethic effective, in spite of conventions and customs utterly hostile to it, and in spite of the sinful frailty of human nature, which of itself is so disinclined towards goodness.

In what does this 'driving force' consist? What is the motive power which enabled ordinary men and women, in spite of the most unfavourable outward circumstances and the most unpromising natural material, to produce in daily conduct this new quality of goodness?

In this article we are considering the question from the point of view of the answers which we find in the New Testament. There may be occasional glances at philosophical points of view, but it is the answer of the New Testament which we seek, and even within the New Testament we shall confine ourselves largely to the Gospels and the Epistles of Paul.

We ask the New Testament therefore: 'Why should a Christian be good?' What are the pressures which constrain him to choose goodness rather than the evil, to which he is naturally more prone?

We shall group the motives which we find under four heads. But this is only for convenience. It does not pretend to represent four logically separable entities. Indeed we find that the groups sub-divide and overlap. But for what they are worth, we discover four distinguishable motives: (1) The Command of God; (2) The Insistence of Conscience; (3) The Consideration of One's Own Highest Welfare; (4) The Natural Outworking of a New Quality of Life which has been implanted.

(1) **The Command of God.** In the Old Testament this is the primary motive. 'Thus saith the Lord' rings constantly through its pages, in the mouth of prophet and lawgiver. The same motive is appealed to equally in the New Testament. We are to love God and love our neighbour because God has said we must. Our Lord condemned the Pharisees in scorching words because they had departed from the commandment of God, and preferred their own interpretations and traditions.

Both in Paul (1 Th 4^{3}) and in First Peter (2^{15}) the summons is sounded: 'This is the will of God,' and for our Lord Himself, it is the final court of appeal: 'As Thou wilt' (Mk 14^{36}).

There are, however, other ways in which the command of God can be mediated to us, as well as through prophet and lawgiver, or through our own sensitiveness to His voice.

(*a*) The command of God is laid on us equally by the character of God, by what God is as well as by what He says. The example of God imposes its obligation upon us. We are to love our enemies and do them good, because that is God's way. He is kind to the unthankful and evil, and sendeth rain on the just and unjust (Lk 6^{35}; Mt 5^{45}). We are to be merciful, because our Father is merciful. We are to love one another, because love is of God (1 Jn 4^{7}). In the parable the one who represents God says to man: 'I forgave thee . . . thou shouldest have had mercy on thy fellow-servant.' In the Epistle to the Ephesians we even find this most startling injunction (which the translators of the Authorized Version felt they had to modify): Be ye imitators of God (5^{1}).

(*b*) In the New Testament what God commands, whether by word or character, is mediated to us through Jesus Christ. Nowhere does God speak so clearly as in Him. Most appropriately is He known as the Word of God become Flesh.

It is true that we are not to treat the moral teaching of Jesus as a New Law. It is rather a description of a New Life. But His words none the less lay obligation upon a Christian. In Lk 9^{35} we hear God's voice delegating to Christ the right to command: 'This is my beloved Son: hear ye him.' We do not need to illustrate at length the command of God through the authoritative word of Christ. It sounds everywhere. In the Sermon on the Mount, 'I say unto you' takes precedence over hallowed custom and the explicit rule of Moses. In Mt 19^{8} he forbids the somewhat easy divorce which Moses had permitted 'for the hardness of men's hearts,' and in Mt 18^{22} he extends the reach of forgiveness beyond the supposed limit of seven offences to seventy times seven. In Jn 13^{34} He gives the 'new commandment' which embraces and supersedes all the rest.

For the Christian a known word of Jesus is the final authority, as it was for the Apostle Paul. In 1 Co 7^{27} the precise injunction of Jesus about divorce is sufficient to make further discussion utterly unnecessary. This is in interesting contrast with Paul's apology that he has nothing better than his own opinion to offer, in the absence of specific direction in the words of Jesus (1 Co 7^{12}; cf. 7^{10}).

(*c*) As God commands both by what He says and by what He is, so He lays His constraint upon us both through the spoken word of Jesus, and also through the example of Jesus. It has often been pointed out that the imitation of Jesus is something less than the fullness of our Christian Faith, but though it is not the fullness, it is certainly a constituent part of that Faith, and particularly so at certain stages of our development. 1 P 2^{21} leaves this beyond doubt: 'Christ left us an example, that ye should follow in His steps.' Paul more than once

declares himself to be an imitator of Christ, and bids his converts seek to reproduce that same pattern, as they can discern in the conduct of Paul himself (1 Co 11^1; 1 Th 1^6). In Ro 15^3 he appeals to the example of Christ, who 'pleased not himself' as a reason why Christian people should be considerate of others. In Jn 13^{15}, after our Lord has washed His disciples' feet, He says: 'I have given you an example.' The same motive is implicit in the plea that we should serve one another, because the Son of man came not to be served but to serve (Mt 20^{26-28}).

In Jn 17^{19} our Lord in His prayer says of His disciples: 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.' For those who know the injunction to love one another, this motive 'for their sakes' is one that often determines conduct. It is that which prompts the Pauline counsel that all that is done must be 'for edification,' for the good of others and the community.

(2) **The Insistence of Conscience.** It is at first surprising how small a part this motive plays in the New Testament. One would expect it to be prominent in any book which deals so much with goodness. Perhaps it is that the writers of the New Testament mainly regarded it as an off-shoot of the motive considered first, in that our acknowledgment of the command of God takes effect in us through the insistence of conscience. Certainly the two motives are not always clearly distinguishable, and there is a dim borderland between the two. We find ourselves in this borderland in the early verses of Ro 12. In *v.*[2] Paul is appealing for that inward transformation which will enable a Christian in any situation to discern the 'will of God,' which is the undisputed authority. But that will is not regarded as some arbitrary standard to be submitted to without question and without understanding. It is recognizable to the enlightened conscience as the will of God, because the will of God is identical with what is 'good, acceptable and perfect.' Whatever we recognize as such at once lays its claim on us, and conscience insists that it should be obeyed.

Paul also explicitly refers to this insistence of conscience, as it is found even in those who are not Christians, in Ro 2^{14-15}. He calls it the 'law written in their hearts.' This is not to be confused with the promise of God to those who come within the New Covenant: 'I will write my law in their hearts.' Rather it means what we normally call 'conscience,' a faculty of our nature which is able to pass moral judgments both on our own actions and on those of others, expressing approval or disapproval, and so acknowledging some standard of conduct which we are under an obligation to observe.

Jesus Himself appealed direct to this power of moral discernment in man. 'Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?', He asked. The same appeal is apparent in the way He had of meeting some one's question with another question of His own, a question which throws light on the original inquiry, and then calls on the inquirer's conscience to frame his own answer. When, for instance, He is asked if a sick man should be healed on the Sabbath, He asks in return: 'Which of you, if his ox or ass fall into a well on the Sabbath, will not draw it out?' (Lk 14^5). Similarly, when challenged about the healing of a deformed woman on the Sabbath, He says: 'You lead your beasts to the water on the Sabbath. Ought not this woman to have been healed?', thus making His appeal at the bar of their conscience.

What is 'right,' what 'ought to be' is an authority needing no external support: Eph 6^1: 'Children, obey your parents . . . for this is right'; Ja 3^{10}: 'These things ought not so to be.' Our Lord makes the same appeal when He distinguishes the 'weightier matters of the law'—justice, mercy, faithfulness—from trivial regulations of a ritual nature, and says of them: 'These things you ought to have done.'

(3) **The Consideration of One's Own Highest Welfare.** Perhaps we should have bluntly called this the 'prudential motive.' It is true that our modern custom in religious circles is to dismiss every method as unworthy which seeks to secure good behaviour by means of the offer of a reward. But there is much in the New Testament about rewards and punishments. It may be urged that they are not offered as inducements or deterrents, but simply represented as plain facts. But to point to consequences is surely not very far removed from advising us to shape our conduct out of consideration of those consequences.

It is true that the conception of material rewards for goodness is not present in the New Testament, though it is commonly found in the Old Testament. There, the good man is promised: 'With long life will I satisfy him,' and 'A thousand shall fall at thy side . . . but it shall not come nigh thee.' Length of days and security from danger are not the rewards of the New Testament. Material rewards are not there offered for moral virtues, but spiritual rewards are there in abundance, and the rewards are not all reserved for the after-life. No man shall leave house, wife, children without receiving manifold more *in this time* and *in the world to come* eternal life. The world to come is certainly felt to be so real that rewards related to it are rewards indeed. So we read of 'treasure in heaven,' and of 'names written in heaven,' and of

those who will be 'recompensed in the resurrection of the just.' But it is not all in the distant future. The reward is also here 'in this time,' and it is characterized as entering into 'life.' So precious is this 'life' that limbs and faculties are well lost in order to gain it. Even the Beatitudes embody something of this prudential motive, for they describe the characteristics of men who are within the Kingdom, but these men have found the secret of the truest happiness, they are 'blessed.' The heart of this true happiness is in the happy relationship with God. 'Your reward shall be great. Ye shall be sons of God,' said Jesus (Lk 6^{35}).

There are punishments, too, to deter us from wrong-doing. Part of the punishment lies merely in missing the rewards, but we read of those who are 'beaten with many stripes' and of 'great darkness,' of 'weeping and gnashing of teeth' and—worst of all—of our Lord Himself ashamed of us.

What Paul, and others, speak of as the Wrath of God includes that aspect of the very constitution of the universe which ensures that in the end, when all is taken into account, evil does not pay, and it does not lead to life's richest treasures, but rather into the loss of all that is most precious.

Besides the frank acknowledgment of rewards and punishments in relation to our conduct, the teaching of Jesus seems to assume that this life of ours works on a kind of reciprocal basis. We get out of life what we put into it. We find in the world outside us a reflection of the world within us. If we are sour and bitter in our hearts, we shall find much bitterness in the world's treatment of us. If we are kind and considerate, we shall often be surprised at the kindness we find in others. 'Blessed are the merciful,' said Jesus, 'they shall find mercy.' The promise may reach out to include God's mercy in life beyond death, but there is surely a more immediate reference also. 'Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.' 'Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.' 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be meted to you.' 'Give, and it shall be given to you,' and not 'in nicely calculated less or more,' but 'good measure, pressed down, running over' (Lk 6^{38}).

This, of course, is not to be taken as an invariable rule, but a general rule, and we can all think of examples of its truth. God's laws are such that those who keep them, though they may not do so from this motive, nevertheless serve their own highest interests. As the Old Testament puts it: 'In the keeping of them there is great reward.' The Book of Deuteronomy with earnest persistence sets before us vivid alternatives: life and death, good and evil, blessing and curse. That which is good brings blessings and leads to life. 'All the commandments of God,' we are told, are not arbitrary regulations without meaning which we must obey blindly, but they are 'for our good.' And Jeremiah offers us the converse when he warns us that disobedience towards God leads to 'your own hurt' (7^{6}). This same truth is repeated by Jesus: 'If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments' (Mt 19^{17}).

Would it be true to say that the moral standards of Jesus are the laws of mental health? Is not this the fundamental truth in Christian Science? Are its exponents not acting in accordance with His teaching when they ask of any illness or mood of depression and discontent which afflicts them, not 'What have I been eating?' but 'What wrong thought or feeling has been at work within me?' Not only such skilled teachers of Psychology as Professor Hadfield and Dr. L. D. Weatherhead, but even staid medical practitioners are now prepared to admit that resentment, jealousy, hatred, discontent, and worry, can induce all kinds of trouble, even physical ailments. These evil things do much hurt in the world, but there is no one who suffers more from them than the one who harbours them. Whereas to have found the secret of dismissing these poisonous moods and feelings, and substituting for them love towards all, is to have found the secret of happiness, and perhaps of health too.

(4) **The Natural Outworking of a New Quality of Life which has been implanted.** This is the specifically Christian motive. The other motives of duty and prudence are here completely transcended. The Christian now acts, not with an eye to future consequences, but from the prompting of something which has already happened, and before which he stands amazed and deeply grateful.

(*a*) Perhaps *Gratitude* will serve to characterize this motive in the first place. We seek to do good, because we are grateful for what God has done for us: for His coming to the world in Christ, for His Cross and Resurrection; and also for His coming with cleansing and healing power into our own lives, bringing forgiveness, reconciliation to Himself, an assurance of our sonship, moral and spiritual renewal, and the hope of heaven. This is the plea with which Paul opens his great chapter on Christian Goodness (Ro 12): 'I beseech you in response to the mercies of God, present your bodies to God.'

We are called to serve God as sons, not just as servants. A servant gives service because of some expected reward in the future. A true son seeks to please his father not with a view to what he may yet get, but out of gratitude for all that he has received, without any deserving, within the privileged communtiy of the family circle. So a

Christian longs to be able to please God out of gratitude for what God has already done.

> My Saviour! how shall I proclaim,
> How pay the mighty debt I owe?
> Let all I have, and all I am,
> Ceaseless to all Thy glory show.

(*b*) The New Testament declares with one voice and tireless reiteration that God has in Christ brought into our poor human lives a power that is able to renew them. The broken image of God in us can through Christ be repaired. We can become new men in Christ. Many different metaphors and word pictures are called into service to express this central truth. Men can be 'converted,' 'redeemed,' 'born again,' 'raised together with Christ,' 'saved,' 'regenerated.'

The Old Covenant of Moses based on duty has been replaced by the New Covenant, dreamed of by Jeremiah, and inaugurated by our Lord. The essence of this new relationship is that the laws of God are no longer external to us but 'written in our hearts,' set within our affections, so that we no longer do the will of God reluctantly, with an effort, but gladly, eagerly. 'They have the commands of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself graven upon their hearts,' wrote Aristeides of the Christians. Something of the old, corrupt nature has been destroyed, and in its place a new nature, a Christ-like nature has been brought into being. If this new nature within us is allowed to work itself out, and the old nature, by the power of Christ, is kept prisoner in chains, then Christlike actions, words and thoughts become the spontaneous and unforced response of the 'new man' in every situation.

'You have put off the old nature, with its doings, and have put on the new nature, which is being renewed . . . after the image of him who created him,' writes Paul (Col 3^{9}), and that new nature finds expression in goodness. When it is allowed to be itself, it produces Christlike conduct.

(*c*) Another way of expressing the same fundamental truth is to say that God bestows upon us the gift of His Holy Spirit. 'Did you receive the gift of the Holy Spirit when you believed?' asked Paul of a group of Christians. This Divine endowment was held to be the mark of the truly converted Christian. The life of God, the very nature of Christ, who is the life-giving spirit, can thus be introduced into our nature. It is like leaven, which seeks to make all our being leavened. It is like a seed which, when allowed to grow, produces lovely fruits. These are the fruits of the Spirit (Gal 5^{22})—love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control—which are the very features of Christlikeness. And these are not the outcome of strained endeavour and heavy-hearted obedience to commands we dislike, but the natural, effortless unfolding of God's gift bestowed on us through Christ.

When Christian goodness is produced in this, the best of all ways, it is marked by an ease and naturalness which gives it a special attractiveness. There is even a certain gaiety about it, too, for we notice that it is marked not only by solemn moral qualities, but also by such happy things as peace and joy. This is Christ's perfect way—when a Christian is good by simply being himself, or, at least, the new man Christ has made of him; when he is good because he enjoys being good, and when his goodness is free from all trace of self-consciousness.

But if this is best, the other motives are all necessary and all good.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Backbone

By the Reverend D. F. Vickers, B.A., B.D., Hamilton

'Daniel purposed in his heart.'—Dn 1^{8}.

Perhaps the most remarkable thing about Daniel is not his deliverance in the lion's den, nor even his escape from the fiery furnace. I think the greatest thing about him was the purpose in his heart. All the other Hebrew boys were ready to do what the heathen king said; but not Daniel. Like Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, he dared to obey God rather than men.

The other boys were like jelly-fishes, carried along with the tide. But Daniel had a backbone of purpose, and instead of being carried along with the tide, he was able to swim against it. You can often see a jelly-fish on the seashore, where it has been washed up by the tide, left high and dry. But you don't often see fish with backbones left high and dry! They have the sense and the strength of purpose to resist the tides and swim out of danger.

When I lived in Derbyshire, the Australians came to play cricket against the County. It was a glorious summer, and I was free to go and watch the game. Although I was early at the ground so were thousands of others. What a queue there was! We had to stand for an hour or two in the blistering heat while the turnstiles slowly

clicked one by one to admit the crowd which grew bigger every minute. When we had been standing about an hour, an official-looking man came alongside the queue, looking for pensioners who, by a gracious gesture on the part of the County Club, were being allowed to go straight into the ground for a shilling only.

An old-looking man in front of me caught the official's eye. 'How about you, sir?' said the official. But the man shook his head and would not go. All the others round about urged him to go forward and get one of the reserved seats, though they themselves knew they would have to stand, even when they got in. The official tried again—'They won't ask for your pension book!' But still the man would not go. Quietly he said, 'It would not matter if they did. I won't be sixty-five for another three months. I learnt at Sunday School to tell the truth and do the right. I won't change now to save one and sixpence and get a seat at a cricket match.'

This unusual statement met with scorn from the others in the queue, and the official, with a shrug and a mutter, went farther up the queue, still looking for pensioners. Don't you think that man was a Daniel? For another hour we stood there without shelter from the sun, slowly moving forward, listening to the uncomplimentary remarks of our neighbours in the queue. 'It would have been all right to accept the official's offer.' 'Fancy standing here when he could have been sitting, *and* saving one and sixpence.' 'Nobody would have known.' But you and I know that Somebody knew! That is how Daniel was able to resist the heathen king's orders. For God helped him, and delivered him out of the fire and the lion's den, for he purposed in his heart to obey God rather than men.

If you had been in that crowd that day, what would you have done? Would you have been on the crowd's side, or the man's? If you had been the man, would you have resisted the offer, or would you have gone and taken the cheap seat? The official and the crowd thought the man was crazy to resist the temptation. But the crowd does not matter. Daniel had a purpose; you and I, too, must have a purpose, for God wants not crowds of jelly-fish men, but real people with real backbones.

What Am I Worth?

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., B.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'. . . one pearl of great price.'—Mt 13^{46}.

In the Walker Art Gallery at Liverpool there is a picture which has a romantic history. (During the War those pictures were sent away from Liverpool for safety, some of them being loaned for six months at a time to schools. This particular picture hung for a while in the hall of the school where I used to teach.)

The artist who painted it was as hard up as most artists. At the time, he was living in a room in Paris. The landlady pressed him to pay his rent, but he could not because his pictures would not sell. At last he had to leave the lodgings and, because he had no money, he gave the landlady four canvases. She did not think they were worth much and stowed them up in an attic.

There they remained. Years later a visitor saw them and thought that he recognised them as the work of an artist who had now become famous. He bought them cheaply, brought them to London, sought out the artist, Sickert, asked him to sign them as his own work, and promptly sold them for £600. Now that the man's work was honoured, people were anxious to buy it.

To the landlady those pictures were useless lumber. But some one recognized their worth. That is what God did with us. How much are we worth? It all depends on how we are valued.

The scientist tells us that we are each made up of so much calcium, so much phosphorus, so much of this and that. Tot it all up, and the chemist would sell you the lot for about seven and sixpence (or perhaps a bit more in these days of inflated prices). Is that what we are each worth?

When the time comes for you to leave school, you will go to get a job. You will hope to persuade an employer that you are worth a couple of pounds a week. Later on, we hope that he will think we are worth a good deal more than that.

But, by the time we have finished our lives here on earth, we hope that our worth will not be measured by the value of the house we have bought, the furniture we have accumulated and the books we have gathered. We hope that we shall have done some good among our fellow-men which only they can measure. If we have been 'worth our salt' (as the Roman soldiers used to say), our value ought to be much more than the hundreds or thousands of pounds we shall have earned during our lives.

But, according to the New Testament, we are worth much more than that. Science may value us at so much, the State at so much, our employers at so much, our friends at so much. But Jesus saw that these paltry sums only represented a fraction of what man was really worth. He saw us as sons of God in the making, whose worth in the sight of God was infinite. That was why He bought us back to the Father at the immeasurable cost of His own life.

Like the man in the Parable of the Pearl Merchant, Jesus saw the value of each one of us and purchased us to Himself. It sounds rather odd to us—this buying of people. But we must remember the number of people in New Testament times who were slaves and who knew what it was to be bought and sold. That is why the ideas of 'redemption' (setting free) and 'ransom' (liberty-price) come so often. Only Jesus knew what man was worth as a son of God; and only Jesus was prepared to make us His own at such tremendous sacrifice.

By the way, those pictures only became really valuable when they bore the artist's name and mark. That goes for us too.

The Christian Year

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Jotham's Parable

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH

'The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honour God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? . . . Then said all the trees unto the bramble, Come thou, and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, If in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow: and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon.'—Jg 9^{8-15}.

When the Jews entered Palestine after their historic journey through the desert under the leadership of Moses, they were anything but a united people. They were divided into a number of tribes, each with its own sheikh and independence. This lack of unity, however, they found a severe handicap when attacked by a common enemy. Thus a move was made to forge the tribes into a nation under one king. The problem was, who was to be monarch? There was a man called Gideon who had delivered the tribes from their foes by his military prowess. In Jewish opinion, nothing better could be done than offer him the throne; but Gideon refused the honour. It so happened that this man was father of a large family. In those polygamous days he had seventy sons by his various wives, and, in addition, an illegitimate boy called Abimelech. So firmly did Gideon believe in a Jewish theocracy that he compelled all his legitimate sons to swear that they would decline the kingship if offered it. With Abimelech, however, it was different. Incensed at having no rights, and warped by an inferiority complex, he plotted to become King of the Jews. With the exception of Gideon's youngest son, Jotham, who managed to escape, Abimelech had all his father's boys murdered. He then turned to the people of his mother's native town of Shechem for support, and, their sympathy being won, they met to proclaim him king at Shechem's Mercat Cross. In the midst of the ceremony, however, a strange happening occurred. Overhanging the town was the mighty Mount Gerizim. In the midst of the proclamation proceedings there appeared on a spur which jutted from the mountain's side Jotham, Gideon's youngest son, who had escaped Abimelech's murdering hand. In ringing tones, which could be clearly heard in the valley below, he told the men of Shechem this parable:

The trees of the forest were set on appointing a king to rule over them. They went in turn to the olive, the fig, and the vine, and invited them to accept office, only to meet with refusal in every instance. Each was busy producing some useful commodity for man, and each felt it would be a mistake to forsake this task for the office of kingship. There was the thorn bush, however, which produced no item of food. It had plenty of time on its hands, so why not ask it? This was done, and that useless bush, fit only for firewood, accepted supremacy of the forest on condition that its rule would be dictatorial. Any tree which denied implicit obedience would be burned to char even though it be the mighty cedar of Lebanon. Such was Jotham's parable; and, having delivered it, he fled for his life.

Just as every parable of Jesus is meant to convey one essential truth, there is one truth, and one truth only, this parable of Jotham seeks to bring home to men in every generation, namely, that if religious people will have nothing to do with public affairs then the result is disastrous. With the exception of a few gallant souls, Christian people have not been conspicuous for the part they have been playing in public affairs during recent years. It is not merely that they have been loth to stand for Parliament or Town Council, if they have the ability for such position, but they have not taken the part they ought in employers' associations or trade unions if they are in industry, or participated in the societies which look after their interests and ideals if they be in the professions. There are various reasons why religious folk in our day tend to fight shy of all public affairs in this manner. For one thing, they know it means sacrifice. Winifred Holtby made the discovery that pity was the enemy of art. She was interested in social problems, but found that to participate in

solving them prevented her being numbered among the literary immortals. She could not be a Charlotte Brontë and Josephine Butler at one and the same time. That was the price of taking part in public affairs for her. The cost is not less for any of us. Social responsibility demands time, the surrender of leisure, culture and a hundred pleasant things. But men of our day are sick of sacrifice. They have fought two wars, known years of privation, and are sacrifice weary. This is one reason why they tend to give public affairs a wide berth. The second is that many religious folk have the feeling that public affairs are a sordid business, and should they have anything to do with them their morality will be adulterated. In that there is some truth, for does not Niebuhr point out that the morality of any body of men is lower than the ethics of the individuals composing it? The morals of any nation, or parliament, or trade union are lower than those of many good souls who are part of these institutions. It means, therefore, that if any religious person takes to do with public affairs he finds himself in contact with societies which practise standards of behaviour lower than his own, with the consequence that his own conduct can be adversely affected if he is not strictly on guard. And, again, some religious people will have nothing to do with public affairs because they have formed the impression that it is wrong for any Christian so to do. They believe that Goebbels was perfectly right when he told the Church leaders of Germany that their business was not to dabble in politics or public affairs, but to prepare souls for the world hereafter.

Now the Church of our day is striving might and main to reveal to its members that to shun or to show apathy towards public affairs is not only a blatant repudiation of Christian duty, but completely disastrous. On the abdication of King Edward VIII, Cosmo Lang came to the microphone and told the country that while we owed a great debt to that monarch for his magnificent service to the Empire, at the same time he had no right to surrender his great trust and his important part in public affairs to gratify his own desire for happiness. All sorts of abuse was hurled at the Archbishop's head for daring to make that utterance, but it left him unperturbed because of a letter received from the Prime Minister. Stanley Baldwin referred to Lang's words as 'the voice of Christian England.' Just as an Archbishop dared to warn a King that he had no right to quit the exacting arena of public affairs, so the Christian Church is trying to bring its members to see that the same thing is true for them. To ignore social responsibility is to refute the whole message of the Incarnation —of Christ's coming into this world to be involved in the affairs of men and to be concerned about them. And, what is more, when religious people will not play their part in public affairs, disaster always follows. The world abounds in unscrupulous adventurers ready to seize their chance of power. When good men shun their public duty, these scoundrels enter public affairs in their stead, grasp office, use it for their own selfish ends, and bring untold misery on their fellows. Surely the events of our day prove that to the hilt, from the rise of tyrants like Hitler and Stalin, to Communists seizing key positions in the trade union movement.

Nowhere is this truth brought out so clearly in all Scripture as in this parable of Jotham. John Donne used to say that when he preached to any audience he also preached to himself. When Jotham delivered this parable about the useful trees refusing the kingship of the forest in turn, and so allowing the thorn bush to secure office and become a tyrant, he was preaching to himself. He was admitting that his religious father, Gideon, had made a mistake in refusing the throne and in making his sons swear to do likewise. That policy allowed Abimelech to seize power, an event which would never have occurred if he and his brothers had done their public duty. But, in this parable, Jotham was also preaching to the men of Shechem. In electing the unscrupulous Abimelech as king they would not have their sorrows to seek. Like the thorn bush in the parable he would bring untold miseries upon them; and never did words prove so prophetically true.

When the Emperor Charles V became heartily sick of public affairs, he fled to a monastery saying, 'I come seeking peace.' But he was not allowed to have peace. Couriers and statesmen constantly sought him out to ask his advice on this matter and that, until it was forced upon him, that however weary he might have been of public duty, he had no right to forsake it. This is one of the primary things the Church of our day is seeking to bring home to all of us within its walls, and rightly so. For, what is it attempting to do but to proclaim afresh to men the message of Jotham's parable about the King of the Trees?

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

New World Symphony

BY THE REVEREND J. ITHEL JONES, M.A., B.D., LONDON

'For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth . . . for the child shall die an hundred years old : ..

they shall build houses, and inhabit them ; . . . They shall not build, and another inhabit ; . . . mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. . . . The wolf and the lamb shall feed together. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord.'—Is 65^{17-25}.

But how long do we have to wait for all this ? In a sense, we don't have to wait at all. Where the Synoptic Gospels speak of the Kingdom of God, the Fourth Gospel speaks of eternal life. This is no contradiction. It just means that for the man who is in possession of eternal life, the Kingdom of God is in promise already achieved. The conditions of the new world are in principle his already because he himself is a new creature in Christ. And it follows that those elements of human life which constantly thwart man's highest endeavours have, for him, lost their sting.

What are these warring factors over which God promises victory to those who are His ? They are all either mentioned or implied in this prophetic paragraph, these powers against which man seems constantly to strive in vain.

1. *The brevity of life.* We all know something of the sense of frustration which this element brings. ' The days of our years are threescore years and ten ; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow ; for it is soon cut off, and we fly away.'

Life seems to pass more quickly to-day than ever. There is so much to do and so little time in which to do it. And that goes not only for the twenty-four hours of the day, but for the seventy or eighty years of a lifetime. So much has to be left half done and so much more entirely untouched that one is completely bewildered. And if that is true concerning those who reach the full span of life, what of those who are cut down in the midst of the years ? Stoke Poges churchyard where Thomas Gray wrote his celebrated Elegy and every place like it tell of what might have been had not the sickle of Death struck so soon.

Now, are not man's yearnings and strivings largely a hopeless fight against this very thing ? He asks himself, ' Is there no way in which I can overcome the brevity of life and defy the forces of change and decay ? '

The folk-tales of all cultures abound in dreams of fulfilment of this desire. There is the story of the phœnix which lives for centuries and then is consumed with fire until from its ashes there arises a new bird. Another tells of the eagle mounting up into heaven until it comes near the centre of fire in the sun. Scorched there, it casts itself into the sea whence it rises again with fresh plumage and renewed vigour. We have our own tale of the lovely Isle of Avalon where King Arthur has gone, where old men become young again and where the young never grow old. There it is, this desire to restore to man his youth, to make this life the scene of everlasting Spring, to defy the brevity of life.

This victory over the brevity of life is one of the things God promises His people in the new world which He creates. The promise is given in this paragraph in somewhat strange terms. ' . . . the child shall die an hundred years old.' The man who dies at a hundred will be regarded as a mere child. That, of course, is a picturesque way of saying that the brevity of life and all its sting will be done away.

For the man who is a new creature in Christ that promise is in principle already fulfilled. On the natural, human side he has to face the same condition of living as his unbelieving associates. He knows the same tragedy of lives cut short. He, too, has to face the prospect of leaving a hundred things untouched. But, and this is the all-important thing, the man who is in Christ is in possession of life which is outside the natural order, a life which is not subject to this tragic cutting short. He knows that if his earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, he has a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

What does this mean ? That the brevity of life, the cause of so much sorrow and tears and despair, has no sting for the Christian. For he belongs already to what God is pleased to call His new world. The life into which he has entered is of such a quality that death cannot touch it. For the man who belongs to God's new order, death has been transformed from a full stop into the merest comma, beyond which his story goes on and on. In the new world which God gives, says Isaiah, the man who dies at a hundred is a mere child. The brevity of life is overcome.

2. The second factor hinted at here which is of the stuff of tragedy and over which God gives the victory is what might be called the *perversity of self-defeat.*

The brevity of life, of which we have spoken, is in a sense an enemy which attacks man from without. This curse of self-defeat is something which seems to arise from within man's very life.

One forceful writer has recently asserted that history is ' a tragic tale of repeated frustration, in which some dark inner irrationality is forever undoing the work of man's hands.' All the time, man's intentions turn into their opposites. ' Human effort seems to be penetrated by a dialectic of defeat and frustration.' In support of this, it can be shown without great difficulty how Capitalism, beginning as free competition,

ends in monopolies. And how, at the other end, Communism, which prophesied the complete dissolution of the State and the principle of force associated therewith, has resulted in a State-system which resists desperately any attempt to destroy it.

There does seem to be a sinister power at the very centre of man's life bringing down all the castles he seeks to build.

In the new life which God gives, men are delivered from this curse. Hear the promise: 'And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. . . . They shall not labour in vain, nor bring forth for trouble.' In my realm, God seems to say, you shall enjoy the fruits of your endeavour. You shall not plan and hope and aspire and then see everything dashed to pieces. Our Lord gave us the same assurance in another picture. The treasure you lay up for yourselves in heaven, says He, is in a place where moth and rust cannot corrupt and where thieves cannot plunder. Moreover, He insists, not only is the reward of your endeavours safe, but things you never regarded as your endeavour find abundant fulfilment there. 'When saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink?' gasped those astonished disciples. 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren. . . .' Here is the least thing done out of a heart of love having its significance heightened beyond recognition. No perverse self-defeat here. On the contrary, all endeavour wears a glittering crown. '. . . mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands.'

3. The third warring element which God is out to defeat becomes clear when we read the last verse of this paragraph. 'The wolf and the lamb shall feed together. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain.'

At the moment, the wolf and lamb certainly do not feed together. On the contrary, we are very conscious of a strange *conflict in the world of Nature*. Tennyson's famous expression comes to mind—'Nature, red in tooth and claw.' It's as though the very creation has gone awry and is out of harmony with God's loving purposes.

In this connexion we cannot help recalling the words of Paul in the eighth chapter of Romans where he speaks of 'the whole creation' groaning and travailing in pain together until now. The principle of evil seems to have got into the natural creation itself.

Whatever be the metaphysical explanation of it (and the doctrine of evolution does not dispose of the problem) we know that even the environment in which man's life is set seems to spoil the designs of the Creator.

The Old Testament writers are very much aware of the need to resolve this problem. We recall their pictures. 'The parched ground shall become a pool, and the thirsty land springs of water: in the habitation of dragons, where each lay, shall be grass with reeds and rushes. . . . No lion shall be there.' There is a similar passage in Is 11 in addition to that in our text.

Now, what is being said in all these poetic passages? What is the meaning of the prophet's highly coloured prophecies in this book about the restoration of harmony and peace to the very creation? Perhaps it is dangerous to seek to answer that question in plain prose. But this, at least, must be said: In God's new world, that realm of life into which He calls us, even the environment will be conducive to the fulfilment of His good purposes.

It is most significant that Paul speaks of the restoration of the creation in the very same breath in which he tells of the resurrection of the body. In the new world which God gives, man's body will be a perfect vehicle of expression moving in an environment in perfect harmony with it. The awful tension of outer and inner will be resolved. And we know that, for us, this has happened already in a very real sense.

> The storm may roar without me,
> My heart may low be laid;
> But God is round about me, . . .

'For, behold,' says God, 'I create new heavens and a new earth.' It is ours now if we are new creatures in Christ. Brevity of life? To us it is illusion. The curse of self-defeat? It does not belong to our order. The warring environment? We are not wholly rid of it, but we do know another environment. For, the saints who are at Philippi are also in Christ Jesus.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Foot-Washing

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., D.D.,
UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.'—Jn 13^8.

Some of you may know that remarkable book *The Adventure* which tells how in 1901 two Oxford ladies, walking in the grounds of Versailles, walked straight back into the year 1789 and saw Marie Antoinette and other great ones of that time. If I could slip back like this into the past, it is not to Paris in the eighteenth century but to an Upper Room in Jerusalem in the year A.D. 30 that I would go.

1. It is the 14th Nisan by the Jewish calendar—Passover Eve—and night has fallen. Over the grey roofs of Jerusalem rides the Paschal moon, now almost full. In the narrow streets all is quiet. 'Not a spark in the warren,' says Robert Nichols—

Not a spark in the warren under the giant night,
Save where in a turret's lantern beamed a grave, still light;
There in the topmost chamber a gold-eyed lamp was lit—
Marvellous lamp in darkness, informing, redeeming it!
For, set in that tiny chamber, Jesus, the blessed and doomed,
Spoke to the lone apostles as light to men entombed;
And spreading his hands in blessing, as one soon to be dead,
He put soft enchantment into spare wine and bread.

. . . . .

He smiled subduedly, telling, in tones soft as voice of the dove,
The endlessness of sorrow, the eternal solace of love;
And lifting the earthly tokens, wine and sorrowful bread,
He bade them sup and remember one who lived and was dead.
And they could not restrain their weeping.
But one rose up to depart,
Having weakness and hate of weakness raging within his heart,
And bowed to the robed assembly whose eyes gleamed wet in the light.
Judas arose and departed: night went out to the night.

Yet the poet has forgotten something, something St. John alone has set on record.

The Supper had begun—that Supper to which all our Lord's Suppers run back—when suddenly, as St. Luke tells us, contention sprang up as to who was greatest among the Twelve. Silently Jesus arose from table, put off His coat, procured a basin and towel, and in a trice was washing the disciples' feet. The Son of God had taken the form of a servant, the Servant of the Lord.

Now with His towel and basin He is at the feet of Judas—Judas who will soon be slipping out into the night to finish his black treachery. What a picture it makes—Jesus at the feet of Judas! Now He moves round to Peter, and Peter, horrified, draws up his feet. 'You, Lord, washing my feet?' 'No, Peter? Then if I do not wash you, you have no part with Me—no share in My fellowship, no stake in My salvation.' The deeper truth begins to break on Peter's mind. 'Then not my feet only—wash me all over,' he cries.

The acted parable is over, and Jesus, assuming His garments again, is at the table's head. 'If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet.'

The Supper proceeds. 'Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray Me.' 'Lord, who is it?' 'It is he to whom I will give this sop.' He hands the sop to Judas. And Judas, having received it, goes out. As the door closes behind him, all catch a brief glimpse of the surrounding darkness.

'And it was night.' Are there four more dramatic words in all literature? Judas was going out from the presence of the Light of the world into outer darkness.

The traitor gone, the spirit of Jesus rises, and in solemn triumph He cries as though all were over, 'Now is the Son of man glorified.' So He speaks of the Cross, which is His 'glory,' and remembering their contention, utters the new commandment. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.' He is going from them, going home to God. 'Where I am going you cannot follow now.' Peter, impulsive as ever, leaps up in protest, 'Lord, I will lay down my life for you.' 'Ah, Peter, Peter, before the cockcrow heralds the dawning, you will have denied Me three times.'

2. It is a wonderful story, moving us alike by its pathos and its splendour, and the words of Jesus are like strains of solemn music heard at sunset.

Yet there is mystery in it, especially in that dialogue between Peter and Jesus. What is in Jesus' mind when He says: 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.' What does Peter mean when he cries, 'Wash me all over'?

Consult the commentators, and most of them will tell you that the foot-washing is simply an acted parable whose theme is the glory of humble service. Beyond any doubt, this is part of the truth, but is it the whole truth?

If you look at the story again with the help of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, our great expert on St. John, you will begin to see something deeper. Remember, to begin with, that all is done almost within the shadow of Calvary, and that He who does the washing is the Servant of the Lord come to give His life a ransom to redeem the many. Look next at the verbs St. John uses to describe Jesus' actions. Jesus *lays down* His garments, and when the washing is over, *takes them again*. These are the very verbs Jesus, the Good Shepherd, had used to describe His atoning death and

resurrection. Above all, recall that the central motif of the story is cleansing, and then remember Jesus' word to Peter, 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.'

The deeper meaning now becomes clear. There is no place in the Christian fellowship for those who have not been purified by the death of Christ. No man is a true Christian unless he own his debt to Christ for all that He has done for him on the Cross. It is the same truth as St. John expresses in his First Epistle: 'The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin.'

This is something that we need to hear and heed. There are people who would like to be Christians but see no real point in Holy Week. They are ready to call Jesus Master—to admire His perfect life and to praise His teaching; but they cannot bring themselves to believe that He died for their sins, and that without His death they would be souls estranged from God. They do not feel the need for cleansing—cleansing by the blood of Jesus. This is one of the major scandals in Christianity for many modern men—and the heart of the gospel.

Yes, the scandal—a Jesus crucified for your sins and mine that we might be reconciled to God—is the gospel, and without it there is no real Good News. We are in immeasurable debt to the Saviour. If He does not purify us by His death, we are yet in our sins. But, and if, we see the Cross aright, if by faith we apprehend that on the Cross He bore our sins that for us there might be condemnation no more, we know that 'we have been bought with a price,' we want to cry with Peter, 'Lord, wash me all over,' and knowing this grace wherein we stand we rejoice in hope of the glory of God.

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Significance of the Incidental

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY

'And after him was Shamgar the son of Anath . . . and he also delivered Israel.'—Jg 3^{31}.

Here is one of the briefest biographies in the Bible and, considering its brevity, one of the most instructive. It opens with the subject's pedigree, describes his attitude to his enemies and then, at the end, as if thrown in casually as an afterthought, comes the mention of a kind of service which would have added lustre to any life and honour to any memory—'and he also delivered Israel.' A modern writer would have put it: 'And incidentally, he saved his country.'

One of the verbal fashions of to-day is the prevalence of the word 'incidentally' in the press, on the wireless and in ordinary conversation. And what follows this sign of the casual is usually quite an important item of information. Perhaps our fondness for this expression is symptomatic of the age in which we live. There may be an affinity between our times and those of Shamgar which may help us the better to understand ourselves. Let us therefore enquire into the significance of life's incidentals.

If Shamgar really did 'deliver Israel' he did a great piece of work. Israel was God's people and anything done for Israel was done as unto God. It seems strange therefore that a mention of it should have been tacked on at the end as if it didn't matter very much whether he had delivered Israel or not. It is as though the record had run: 'Oh, by the way, it may as well be mentioned, but he also delivered Israel.'

First of all, one wonders whether this way of recording service to God was characteristic of Shamgar's age and whether it is of ours. Is it the sign of an age which has removed God from the centre of life and banished Him to the fringes?

1. *Religion—A Side Issue.* Here is a modern instance. Sir Josiah Stamp was a great public servant, a financier, an expert economist and chairman of several railway companies. In an obituary notice mention was made of all these activities and then, at the very end, came this: 'He was also a prominent Wesleyan Methodist.' It often happens that the report of an interview throws more light upon the reporter—and upon the public for whom the report was written—than it does upon the person written about. It seems to have been the case here. If there ever was a man about whom it could be said that religion was the rule of his life, and not a casual incident of it, that man was Josiah Stamp. And yet, for the benefit of the public of that day, Josiah Stamp's religion was only worth a casual mention, as an afterthought. 'And he *also* delivered Israel.' Politics, economics, big business—all that is front-line news; but religion: that doesn't cut much ice! Such an assessment of a good man's life is symptomatic of an age which has taken God away from the centre and relegated Him to the periphery. 'They chose new gods'—that was the judgment upon Shamgar's age by a later one and it may be the judgment of posterity upon our own.

Perhaps Shamgar himself was the sort of man who put God among life's 'alsos' and for whom religion had lost its centrality and only flickered fitfully somewhere along the circumference. 'Oh, it is hard to work for God,' as the hymn says. But it is no trouble at all when it is something that you want to do for yourself. Perhaps

Shamgar had slipped into the habit of only giving God that for which he had no immediate use himself. Thomas Phillips of Bloomsbury used to tell this story with relish. It was about a farmer who had a cow called Daisy of which he was very proud. One day she gave birth to two calves, a quite unusual event. 'Mary, my dear,' he said to his wife, 'God has been very good to me. I am going to give one of these calves to the Lord.' There was one difficulty. Both of them were such fine little calves that he couldn't make up his mind which of them to give to the Lord. One day, when they were about three months old, they were out with their mother cow in the meadow when a thunderstorm came on and the lightning killed one of the calves. When the farmer made the discovery, he hastened to his wife and said: 'Mary, my dear, the Lord's calf is dead.'

For the man who puts God among the incidentals of life it is always the Lord's calf that gets killed.

We may, however, be doing Shamgar a disservice. The really significant things of life may be the things which one does instinctively and even unconsciously when one is thinking about something else.

2. *The Incidental—The Real.* 'And he also delivered Israel.' Perhaps this act of deliverance was not an exceptional performance done once in a way but belonged to the very texture and quality of his daily life. In that case, the description is apt—'and he *also* delivered Israel.' Commander King-Hall used to end his Children's Hour talks something like this: 'Be good! But not *so* good that people will be saying: Now what mischief is he up to now?' It is possible, by a supreme effort, to surpass oneself and deceive others. They have a word for it in America. When a schoolboy tries to curry favour with his teachers they call him an 'apple polisher.' But what reveals the nature of the soil is not the fruit we polish but the fruit we produce—in the daily business of living. It is by the 'idle word,' says Jesus, that we are judged, and not by the fashioned phrase. In a sense, real religion is not revealed in the intentional but in the incidental things of life. 'If you want to know what my religion is,' said a great surgeon, 'come and see me operate.'

There can be too much self-regard even in our preoccupation with the coming of the Golden Age, too much of what our Lord meant when He said: 'Lo, here! Lo, there!' John Stuart Mill has described how it took him some time to discover the significance of the incidental in life. In his *Autobiography* he wrote: 'Those only are happy . . . who have their minds fixed on some subject other than their own happiness; on the happiness of others, on the improvement of mankind, even on some art or pursuit, followed not as a means, but as itself an ideal end. Aiming thus at something else, they find happiness by the way.' And perhaps the Kingdom of Heaven, like happiness, will come by a side-wind.

3. *Salvation—A Surprise.* We may be doing Shamgar an even graver injustice. The word 'also' may have another shade of meaning. Readers of the Hebrew Bible will naturally feel that the stress falls upon the pronoun—'gam *hu*'—'and *he* also delivered Israel.' Yes, *he* also, Shamgar, is among the judges of Israel! He, also, is among the servants of the Lord, is a link in the great chain of faith through the ages. '*He*, also, delivered Israel.'

But did he? Poor Shamgar! If he did, he did not finish his work. Who ever did? Who ever has? Shamgar was not the first who took a hand in this work, nor was he the last. And in the ranks of God's servants there are many illustrious names. Moses—he also delivered Israel, but he did not complete his task. Nor did Joshua, nor did David, nor did Paul or Peter or any of the great company of saints, apostles, and martyrs.

What I want to point out is this: that here, in this great company of the servants of God, is a man like Shamgar—'and *he* also delivered Israel.' Perhaps nobody would have been more greatly surprised than Shamgar himself at the place assigned to him by the Holy Spirit of God in the history of the Faith. He might say: 'I also? But who am I? What have I ever done to deserve this honour? I had a hard task and I failed in the doing of it. I tried, but I only met with disappointment and defeat! Is it not written against me: In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath . . . the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways?'

How generous are God's judgments of us! Just like Jesus' own—'she hath done what she could.' Yes, 'and *she* also delivered Israel.' Some one has said that the only ones who are sure to go to heaven are those who will be most surprised at finding themselves there. 'Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.' 'And *ye* also delivered Israel.'

'In such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh.' *As ye think not*—those are the shining words. For when He comes, He will bring with Him many a surprise—the surprise that lies at the heart of salvation itself, and the surprise of finding, written across the earthly record of the least deserving of us, the magnanimous estimate: 'and *he* also delivered Israel.'

Literature

THE LORD'S SUPPER

No. 6 in the series 'Studies in Biblical Theology' is a stimulating and suggestive treatment of the eucharistic narratives and sayings by the Rev. A. J. B. Higgins under the title, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (S.C.M.; 7s. net). The writer's debt to the fine study of Joachim Jeremias, 'Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu' [2nd ed. 1949], is manifest throughout, but he does not hesitate when necessary to prefer his own conclusions. Against most British scholars he holds, with Dalman and Jeremias, that the Last Supper was the Paschal Meal, thus favouring the Markan in preference to the Johannine setting. He rejects the view that the Supper was an anticipatory Sabbath or Passover *kiddush* or a meal like those of the Pharisaic *haburoth*. The expedients by which Jeremias overcomes the difficulties raised by Markan statements are for the most part accepted, and it is assumed that statements like Jn $13^{1.\ 29}$ 18^{28} and 19^{14} are theologically coloured and, therefore, not to be trusted. Mk $14^{1f.}$ is explained, in agreement with Jeremias, as meaning 'not in the presence of the festival crowd.'

A detailed treatment is given to the form of the eucharistic sayings, for which we cannot be too grateful. Dr. Higgins endorses the view that the Markan account 'is shown by its Aramaisms to be more primitive than Paul's version,' but he thinks that the phrase 'of the covenant' in Mk 14^{24} is a later addition, while freely granting that 'the covenant idea may have been to the fore in the thought of Jesus.' He also reflects the growing tendency to accept the longer text in Lk 22^{15-20}, and suggests that it is a combination of two traditions in *vv.* 15–19a and 19a–20. Commenting on the Pauline words, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' he writes: 'We cannot really be certain whether Jesus in so many words enjoined the repetition of what was done at the Last Supper, though the tradition that He did is certainly in harmony with His intention on that occasion,' and he questions the fascinating interpretation of Jeremias that the command means 'that *God* may remember me.' How far theology has travelled in recent years is shown by his quiet observation: 'There is no need to argue the point that Jesus attached a sacrificial and redemptive significance to His death. We have only to point to Mk x. 45 . . .' and by his conclusion: 'The upshot is that Jesus at the Last Supper alluded to His approaching death as a sacrifice of atoning efficacy, and likened Himself to the Passover lamb whose death had already taken place.'

Not the least of many benefits Dr. Higgins has conferred on New Testament students is his patient examination of the distinction which Lietzmann and others have drawn between the simple type of bread breaking mentioned in such passages as Ac 2^{46} and the kind of Eucharist which Paul describes. He has no doubt that the distinction is false and gives good reasons for his opinion. What Paul did, he contends, was to lay a renewed emphasis on the remembrance of the death of Christ which was already present, but which at Corinth was in danger of being forgotten.

With much interest and penetration the last two chapters discuss Pauline and Johannine teaching. The cup of blessing, he submits, is a means of sharing in the blood of Christ, in the sense that believers can appropriate to themselves the benefits of His sacrificial death. Whether Dr. Higgins is equally successful in maintaining that, when Paul speaks of sharing in the body of Christ (1 Co 10^{16}), he means the Church, is more open to question, although several commentators have taken this view. He also holds, with Anderson Scott, that 'the body' mentioned in 1 Co 11^{29} is the Church. We are, in fact, challenged throughout this important book, especially by the submission that the Johannine story of the Feet-washing is an allegory of the Eucharist, and by the claim that the 'words of institution' 'were suggested by the presence of the lamb on the table before the guests.'

It is to be regretted that this excellent series gives such little space to its contributors. We should have welcomed two hundred pages from Dr. Higgins instead of a meagre ninety-six. One unavoidable effect is that sometimes he is compelled summarily to dismiss a thesis which calls for extended discussion, as, for example, the quite reasonable, and not improbable suggestion of Théo Preiss and others that, while not a Passover Meal, the Last Supper had a Paschal character. It seems hardly good enough merely to say, 'This solution of the problem is quite unconvincing.' I hope, however, I have said enough to show that Dr. Higgins has written a book of first importance. He is undoubtedly a leading member of that growing band of younger scholars to whom we must look increasingly in the future for the discussion and elucidation of New Testament problems.

VINCENT TAYLOR

ECUMENICAL FOUNDATIONS

Most people realize, however vaguely, that the Movement which is called Ecumenical has a

missionary ancestry. In *Ecumenical Foundations*: A History of the International Missionary Council and its Nineteenth-Century Background, by Dr. William Richey Hogg (Harper; $5.00), for the first time the full pedigree is traced, the facts are set in proper order, and the story of development is told. Dr. Hogg reviews, perhaps too briefly, the beginnings of Protestant missions. Not long after the formation of the missionary agencies themselves comes organization for mutual consultation and co-operation. 'The earliest and most informal of these organizations began in London in 1819. Yet almost forgotten by English-speaking peoples is the fact that more effective and more formally organized missionary co-operation grew up in the second half of the nineteenth century on the Continent.'

Another salutary corrective to Anglo-American thinking is Dr. Hogg's reminder that the first demands for an international organization, and one on a world scale, came from Germany. Valuable also is his emphasis upon the decisive part played by the Student Movement. This is true of preparation for Edinburgh 1910, true at Edinburgh, and true of the road that led therefrom. 'Some younger men were appointed stewards. Among them were: John Baillie, J. McLeod Campbell, Kenneth Kirk, William Manson, Walter Moberly, William Paton, Neville Talbot, and William Temple.'

Edinburgh 1910 has often been reviewed, but seldom by a more discerning eye. Dr. Hogg leads us to follow the work of the Continuation Committee through the years of the First World War, to the fruition beyond, in the growth of National and Regional Christian Councils. The International Missionary Council itself results in 1921, and so we continue, through Jerusalem 1928, with its strong social concerns, and Secularism seen as chief enemy on a world scale, to Madras 1938, and its heightened sense of churchmanship. By the time of the second world conflict, we are justified in setting over against it World Christianity. The organization which represents it does notable war service, not least that for 'Orphaned Missions.' Relations with the emergent World Council are traced, and the book closes with a valuable epilogue on Observations, Crises, Obstacles, and Achievements.

Perhaps the best praise for Dr. Hogg as a historian is to say that he shows himself a worthy pupil of Professor Latourette, adding to his master's careful orderliness a welcome exuberance of his own. This is no dry-as-dust record, but the work of one who shows enthusiasm for his subject, and lets great figures have a little space to come to life. Since the greatest figure is John R. Mott, let our illustration relate to him. After being responsible in 1886 for bringing an American student to decision for Christ, J. E. K. Studd wrote: 'Of all the students with whom I have come into contact . . . there is one you have to keep your eye on as a leader in your work, Mott of Cornell.' Hogg adds the exclamation, 'Prophetic words!' A few pages later Hogg is discussing the watchword of the Student Volunteer Movement—'The evangelization of the world in this generation.' Were those who framed it guilty of the naïve simplicity of which it has become fashionable to accuse them? He wisely says, 'The majority understood by it the *responsibility* of each generation to make the gospel known to all mankind in that generation. . . . The watchword then was a call to obligation, not a prophecy of fact.'

Yet we do find Mott among the prophets, this time with regard to the World Student Christian Federation. For in 1895 he wrote: 'It will be a great unifying force . . . and a yet more significant result—the hastening of the answer to our Lord's prayer, "that they all may be one. . . ." The Federation unites in common purpose and work the coming leaders of Church and State in all lands.' It will be seen that this is a book to read, a book to suggest to your Library, and an essential to the Church History section of any Theological Library.

There are a few mistakes: Wesley was hardly 'a missionary to the Indians in Georgia' (p. 4). S.P.C.K. is wrongly named ('Promotion of' instead of 'Promoting') on p. 42. It is a reversal of the order of time to say that Vanderkemp as a South African pioneer (1799) 'became for future work there what Morrison was in China' (1807) (p. 11). Reference to Prayer Societies on pp. 11 and 59 are inexact. One regrets the existence, if they do exist, of the verb 'to mushroom' (meaning to grow quickly), and the adjective 'intersocietal'; and one prefers things to be 'fraught' with great consequences, rather than 'freighted.' American publishers seem to favour the massing of notes at the end—in this volume, fifty pages of them. The result for this reviewer was that he read on with hardly a reference to them, but with a bad conscience the while for their neglect. *Foot*notes are the thing, and the comfort of the reader should be put before the ease of the compositor.

JOHN FOSTER

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE APOCALYPSE

To some people the Apocalypse has been nothing but one vast piece of irritation. Luther, for instance, heartily disliked it. He complained that the book itself quite unjustifiably promised blessedness to those who kept the things that were

written in it, and a curse to those who did not, because, he said, no one had ever been able to discover what actually was written in it. And yet it is a curious fact that on no New Testament book have so many excellent commentaries been written. When the student turns to study the Apocalypse he is indeed fortunate to have at his disposal the works of Swete, Moffatt, Beckwith, and, above all, of Charles. *The Book of Unveiling*, by the Rev. Canon M. R. Newbolt (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), is a new commentary on the Apocalypse. Canon Newbolt does not spend much time on the historical background; rather his intention is to elucidate the meaning of the Apocalypse in a way that is largely independent of local circumstances. The lay-out is that a portion of the English text is printed and followed by a longer or shorter exposition of it.

In his interpretation of the Apocalypse Canon Newbolt has certain basic principles. First and foremost, and rightly, he refuses to use the Apocalypse as a repository of prophecies and forecasts of things to come. 'To treat it as a magic book to conjure with, like *Old Moore's Almanac*, is to degrade it into an instrument of superstition . . . by reading into the book what is not there and to make it, not a blessing, but the reverse.' 'St. John sees principles which are manifested in history rather than events.' Second, Canon Newbolt holds that John was a passive recipient of visions and voices and pictures in the mind. 'Mountains of erudition have been erected on a basis which ignores this fact; the academic mind prefers to think of St. John as working with the Old Testament and the Pseudepigrapha before him, fluttering the leaves in search of material for his great work.' The book is 'a dream vision, not a scholar's allegory.' Third, Canon Newbolt holds that the book is 'The Collected Visions of St. John.' It may well be composed of visions which came to John over a period extending from A.D. 37 until A.D. 95. The sections of it are not small pieces of a jig-saw puzzle to be fitted together in some coherent scheme, as if it had been written at a sitting. 'They are not to be compared to displaced fragments of a large panorama, but to separate studies hung on the walls of a gallery or to little illustrations in the pages of a magazine.'

There are many suggestive things in the book. The fact that John heard the great voice like the sound of a trumpet *behind him* (Rev 1^{10-12}) might well indicate that for some previous time he 'had turned his back on the truth that the vision expressed.' The famous passage in 13^{8} means that 'redemption is the eternal act of Him who is eternal.' The terrible picture in $7^{2,3}$ means that 'the world exists on sufferance from moment to moment, and we with it.' The white stone in 2^{17} with the protection which it gives may find its origin in the identification card given to the citizen who had conformed to the order to sacrifice to Cæsar and who was safe in a worldly sense.

There is no doubt that to read this book will help any one to enter into the meaning of the Apocalypse and to see its relevance for life.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

THE THEOLOGY OF CALVIN

The Rev. T. H. L. Parker, M.A., B.D., Vicar of Brothertoft, who has already written on Calvin's preaching, has now made a further contribution to Reformation studies with *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God*, a Study in the Theology of John Calvin (Oliver and Boyd; 10s. 6d. net). Part One deals with the knowledge of the Creator. 'Calvin . . . presupposes the existence of God, on the very ground, the validity of which St. Thomas denies, that men have an innate knowledge of the existence of God.' But 'Calvin always follows what appear to be generous concessions to natural theology by denying any religious validity to them at all.' Thus, after some discussion of the famous metaphor of the spectacles, we gather that man is suffering from total blindness: the only function of the works of God as revelation is to make man inexcusable. The author goes on to show how through the Word we receive a knowledge of God as Creator. Part Two deals with the knowledge of the Redeemer, and includes much interesting material on Calvin's Christology and soteriology.

The book is written in an austere and demanding style, enlivened by an occasional tart comment on the widespread ignorance of Calvin. It shows a thorough knowledge of Calvin's works, and contains numerous quotations from and references to the *Commentaries* as well as to the *Institutes*. It also makes interesting use of the difference between the various editions of the *Institutes*. Mr. Parker is clearly a convinced follower of Calvin, and does not seek to assess or to criticize, but only to expound his master, though he occasionally compares him with other theologians. Thus, for instance, he refers to the book 'Natural Theology,' which contains the chief documents in the dispute which broke out on that subject between Barth and Brunner nearly twenty years ago. There Barth said: 'What Calvin wrote in those first chapters of the *Institutes* has to be written again and this time in such a way that no Przywara and no Althaus can find in it material for their fatal ends.' A comment on this from Mr. Parker would have been very interesting; but he prefers the calmer task of loyal exposition: and systematic theologians who are engaged in this still unfinished

struggle will be grateful to a historical theologian for his account of chapters which, while they do not settle the issue, have yet been of considerable importance in the struggle.

A. Raymond George

MIND AND LIFE

The chapters of this book—*Mind and Life*, by Sir Arthur Tansley (Allan and Unwin ; 15s. net)—are to a certain extent self-contained essays, but they have an ideological unity, and represent a philosophical attitude, consistently and brilliantly indicated, towards problems of universal interest. In making use of the sub-title, 'An Essay in Simplification,' Sir Arthur Tansley sets up a high ideal. Many writers promise to be simple, and fail to keep their promise ; others succeed in being simple and nothing more ; but in this book we have the double attainment of both simplicity and profundity. The author has little patience with scientific 'jargon,' but does not minimize the importance of the truth which the technical phrases try to express. His argument is firmly based on biology and psychology, but is not imprisoned by these sciences, nor, at the other extreme, does he sympathize with those who, for the purposes of their supposed defence of the spiritual, depreciate the achievements of physical science. The underlying idea of the book is that it must be admitted that man *is* an animal, but it must also be affirmed that he is much more than an animal. Mind is a function of the organism as a whole, dependent in general on the body, but also claiming an independence or autonomy of its own. And beyond the mind there is the 'soul,' concerned with spiritual values, the psychological reality of which even professed materialists implicitly admit, while their metaphysical reality may be established, alongside of a full acceptance of evolutionary processes and the findings of modern psychology, by the mystical—but not imaginary—conclusion that man is, at all stages of his development, drawing from the resources of a spiritual reality, akin to himself and ready with disclosure as man in his growth becomes capable of appreciation.

Sir Arthur is very critical of those who would dismember human experience and rush to fanatical extremes, but his criticism is always discriminating. While he pours the vials of his wrath chiefly on people like behaviourists, or, more generally, on those who would 'write down' heredity in favour of the exclusive influence of cultural environment, and while he can be very severe on certain Freudian conceptions, he reaches always a balanced judgment between antagonistic attitudes. The opposing claims of determinism and freedom have satisfying justice done to them, and we have rarely seen a better exposition of the good and bad elements in Communism or a more adequate explanation of the attraction which it has for many minds, not only of the under-privileged but also of the frustrated idealists. The conclusions about Socialism, over against free enterprise, could form the basis of a most useful tract for the times.

In regard to the relation between much modern thought and religion the book is both cautious and confident. The author does not make gratuitous gifts to illogical scientists or materialistic philosophers of weapons wherewith they may bludgeon the believers in religion, and he leaves the latter with a strengthened belief in spiritual realities. A preacher also would find it to be a book which, within moderate compass, would fill up gaps in his scientific and philosophical knowledge and at the same time reinforce the relevance of his sermons.

W. S. Urquhart

The Living Church in the Parish, edited by the Rev. Frank Colquhoun, M.A. (Church Book Room ; 6s. net), is one of the 'Living Church Manuals.' It consists of six chapters by six different writers. The chapters and authors are : 'The Worship of the Parish Church,' by the Very Rev. H. A. Evan Hopkins, M.A. ; 'The Administration of the Sacraments,' by the Rev. Frank Colquhoun, M.A. ; 'Parochial Evangelism,' by the Rev. L. F. E. Wilkinson, M.A. ; 'The Teaching Church,' by the Rev. William Leathem, B.A. ; 'Training for Confirmation,' by the Rev. Hugh Jordan, M.A., B.D. ; 'The Fellowship of the Church,' by the Rev. Laurence P. Sheath, L.Th. There are three appendices—'The Parish Prayer Meeting,' by the Rev. J. R. W. Stott, M.A. ; 'Parish Church Music,' by Mr. John H. Humphries ; 'The Parish Magazine,' by the Rev. Frank Colquhoun, M.A. This book is written in terms of the Church of England, but it is a book with such a challenge and enthusiasm that any minister of any Church would find profit in reading it. But are not some of the statements rather reckless ? 'The truth of the matter is that too many church-goers look on their church as a kind of religious club which holds a very cheap form of spiritual ramble every Sunday, and other more exciting social functions during the week.' 'The fact is that the average local church is usually judged either by the eloquence or activity of its incumbent, or by the success of its whist drives and dances.' 'Going to church is considered a painless method of spending a dull day for those who can think of nothing better to do, or who have some ulterior motive in doing it.' There is given a recipe for a typical modern sermon

—' Take a teaspoonful of weak thought, add pickings from other minds, stir the mixture listlessly, water it down to taste, and serve in small doses at a time lukewarm.' But any faults this book has are faults born of enthusiasm. It has the supreme merit of being a disturbing challenge.

The Rev. Douglas Horton, D.D., Moderator of the International Congregational Council and Minister of the General Council of Congregational Churches in the U.S.A., gives us a well-written, interesting and informative little book—*Congregationalism, A Study in Church Polity* (Independent Press ; 6s. net). The book embodies lectures which the author delivered at Mansfield College, Oxford, last year. We get information on the beginnings of Congregationalism in America. We are guarded against some misconceptions which have been prevalent. The body did not like the name ' Independents ' ; they are not to be confounded with the Separatists of the seventeenth century ; they have all along been concerned with Fellowship among the individual congregations. The one point on which they stand fast is the basic conviction that the Congregation is the true unit of the Church with rights and responsibilities which must not be surrendered. They are ready to unite with any other church provided that that basic right is not infringed.

With another Divorce Commission sitting, and so many apparently intent on altering the laws governing the dissolution of marriage, it is right that the Church should state its position more clearly than it has done hitherto. Accordingly this book by the Rev. Derrick Sherwin Bailey, formerly Chaplain to Anglican students in Edinburgh, and now Central Lecturer, Church of England Moral Welfare Council, is to be welcomed. *The Mystery of Love and Marriage : A Study in the Theology of Sexual Relation* (S.C.M. ; 12s. 6d. net) has original work in it, and marriage is studied against the background of Christian thought and experience from New Testament times onward. Much attention is given to the Early Fathers, though it may be pointed out that the Reformers are very largely ignored, and that one would obtain the impression that since the Reformation only in Anglican circles has the theme been discussed at all.

The main part of the book is taken up with a discussion of ' Union in " One Flesh." ' The writer deals with ' One Flesh ' and Marriage, The Nature of Union in ' One Flesh,' Indissolubility and Divorce, ' One Flesh ' and the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Analogical Significance of Union in ' One Flesh,' among other aspects of his theme. Perhaps his most interesting chapter is that on the Analogical Significance of the ' One Flesh.' The book is not at all popular in its appeal, but it provides a great deal of information not to be easily acquired elsewhere. A useful bibliography is appended, and there is not withheld that most valuable addendum, an Index.

Mr. Bailey is to be congratulated for this exploratory work in a new field, and for the contribution he has made to the fuller understanding of the Christian doctrine of marriage.

In the Januaries of 1947–49 Karl Barth conducted a Seminar on Prayer in the Catechisms of the Reformation—Luther's, Calvin's, and that of Heidelberg. His lectures were taken down in shorthand, and have been translated into English by Mrs. Sara F. Terrien, and now appear as a small volume—*Prayer* (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; $1.50). It is very interesting to have such a representation of Barth lecturing in the class-room. The book consists of a brief treatment of Prayer, and then an exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Many arresting and suggestive things are said as one would expect. Many a little aside is introduced that is excellent, for example, ' may we stop leafing through the Bible instead of reading it ' (p. 45) ; ' how irritating are those people who with a perpetual smile, run after you to forgive you ! ' (p. 67).

His words as to ' deliver us from the evil one ' are striking—' Far from me the idea of preaching the Devil to you. . . . Nevertheless, there is in this matter a reality that we modern Christians pass over too lightly. There exists a superior ineluctable enemy whom we cannot resist unless God comes to our aid.'

The translation in the main is very well done, but two passages (pp. 54, 75), as they stand just do not make sense. Either the stenographer or the translator has got Barth wrong.

The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls

By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., B.Litt., The University, Manchester

Ever since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls became known, controversy as to their age has been acute, and widely different views have been maintained. While no agreement is yet in sight, the field of disagreement has been narrowed to some extent. It is probable that the further discoveries which have been made in 1952 will contribute to that end, and, indeed, they have already served to eliminate some of the proposed datings. The story of the earlier discoveries is well known, but of the more recent it is still but partially known. Father de Vaux sent a communication about them to the Paris Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres, which was read on 4th April 1952. The complete paper has not yet been published, but the fullest report of it was published in *The Manchester Guardian* of 7th April.[1] It told of the excavation of Khirbet Qumrân, quite close to the cave where the Scrolls were found, and of the discovery there of a jar sunk in the floor, of the same type as the jars in which the Scrolls were found. Beside it in the same building were coins of various dates, but all from the first century A.D. and earlier than the Destruction of the Temple. In addition in another cave fragments of a number of manuscripts were found, together with some coins of the period of Bar Cochba's revolt in the second century. So far as is yet known, there is nothing to connect these manuscripts with those found at 'Ain Feshkha, but the jar of Khirbet Qumrân brings evidence that directly concerns the earlier finds. Yet more recently a further find has been announced from yet another spot. This is a metal scroll, inscribed with a text that appears to come from the same sect as the 'Ain Feshkha Scrolls. This has to be subjected to careful treatment, so that it may be unrolled and its text read.

In discussions on the Scrolls three quite distinct issues have been frequently confused: (1) the date of the composition of the non-Biblical texts; (2) the date of the copying of the manuscripts, both Biblical and non-Biblical; and (3) the date of the deposit of the manuscripts in the cave at 'Ain Feshkha. That the three issues though distinct are yet related is, of course, true, but when 'the date of the scrolls' is referred to it is often not made clear which of these three dates is in mind. For a long interval must have separated the first from the third. There is no evidence that the manuscripts found were the authors' autographs, and it is highly improbable that they were. The cave seems once to have contained at least a hundred and fifty manuscripts. We can hardly suppose that these were all written within a very short space of time, and it would be surprising if the ones that have survived were all contemporary manuscripts. One of them, the St. Mark's Isaiah Scroll, bears the marks of long use, and even of repair.[2] From the study of the contents of the texts, and also of the *Zadokite Work*, fragments of which were published early in the present century,[3] we can learn something of the history of the sect from which these texts came. For it is certain that the *Zadokite Work* and Dead Sea Scrolls came from a single sect. The study of the contents as well as the archæological evidence and the palæography must provide the basis of our answers to the threefold problem with which we are confronted.

Mr. Bleddyn Roberts has recently expressed the opinion that it is useless to try to determine the historical background of the texts, since the indications are so imprecise and cryptic.[4] This is unduly pessimistic. It is true that those who have attempted this task have reached very different conclusions, but some of the views have been based on a small selection of the data or built on strained interpretations of the texts. Taken alone, many of the individual references in the texts could be given half a dozen possible references. It is when we look at the evidence as a whole that we may hope to make some progress. Professor Dupont-Sommer has attempted this more fully than most of those who have discussed the

[1] Cf. also *Le Monde*, 9th April 1952; W. Baumgartner, in *Neuer Zürcher Zeitung*, 29th April 1952; L. Rost, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, lxxvii [1952], 277 ff., 317 ff.

[2] Cf. J. C. Trever, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, i: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* [1950], p. xiii. ff.

[3] Cf. S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, i: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* [1910]. The most accessible English translation is found in R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. [1913], 786 ff. For a convenient edition of the Hebrew text, cf. L. Rost, *Die Damaskusschrift* [1933]. S. Zeitlin has recently published an edition containing for the first time facsimiles of the fragments, in *The Zadokite Fragments* [1952].

[4] Cf. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxxiv. [1951–52], 377.

texts,[1] and though the present writer does not share his views he would acknowledge this most readily. In not a few respects his views are likely to stand, though in others they have been fiercely criticised and rest on doubtful and disputed translations of critical passages, and on uncertain dates given in other sources.[2] To him, nevertheless, is credit due for the seriousness of his effort to integrate all the available evidence in a consistent and coherent theory.

The archæologists who explored the cave declared quite firmly that the jars in which the manuscripts were hidden were late Hellenistic in type,[3] and that they could not have been placed in the cave later than *c.* 100 B.C. Even granting the precision of the dating of the jars, it was clear that the precision of the dating of their deposit in the cave could not be established. Father de Vaux went so far as to state categorically that the jars were made specifically to hold these particular manuscripts at the time of their deposit in the cave.[4] This was certainly going beyond the evidence. If this date for the deposit could be fixed, then the copying of the manuscripts would have to be put long before that, and the composition of the non-Biblical texts would have to be put even earlier. The new discoveries of 1952, however, have so clearly proved that this dating was wrong that Father de Vaux, with fine frankness, has withdrawn it.[5] It is clear from the Khirbet Qumrân jar that this type of pottery was in common household use in the first century A.D., and that it cannot be said that the 'Ain Feshkha jars must have been either made or deposited so early as 100 B.C., while it is now equally impossible to maintain that the jars must have been made specifically to hold these manuscripts. This does not tell us anything about the actual age of the manuscripts, let alone about the date of the composition of the texts they contain, but it proves that there is now no reason to place the *end* of the history of the Scrolls, prior to their discovery in 1947, so early as had been claimed.

In the same way a number of considerations have rendered improbable the late dating which had been maintained in some quarters. Professor Driver has argued for a date in the seventh or eighth century A.D.,[6] but has more recently brought this down to a date somewhere between A.D. 200 and A.D. 500,[7] while Professor Zeitlin,[8] and Mr. P. R. Weis [9] have argued for a much later date than any of these. It is increasingly improbable that the date of the copying of our manuscripts should be put so late as A.D. 200, and the later dates are now virtually impossible.

Some writers have overpressed the palæographical argument and have claimed to be able to date the manuscripts with great precision on palæographical grounds.[10] As against this Professor Driver has had no difficulty in showing that the argument is quite unconvincing.[11] The paucity of material coming from the period to which the Scrolls are dated, and the fact that most of it is itself of debatable age, makes it impossible for palæography to be an exact science for this period.[12] In the same way Professor Driver has dismissed the argument from the age of the jars by observing that this cannot determine the age of their contents.[13] A third argument for an early date has been based on the radiocarbon text.[14] This test was carried out on a sample of the cloth wrappings found in the cave, and it established a mean date of A.D. 33 for the material from which the cloth was made, with a margin of error of two hundred years either way. Here it is to be noted that the test was carried out on the cloth and not on the manuscripts themselves, since they would be destroyed in the process.[15] Moreover, the test cannot be relied upon implicitly, since a single test

[1] Especially in his *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* [1950] (Eng. Tr. by E. M. Rowley, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* [1952]).

[2] For some discussion of these questions, cf. the present writer's forthcoming book *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

[3] Cf. R. de Vaux, in *Revue Biblique*, lvi. [1949], 234, 586 ff.; G. Lankester Harding, in *Illustrated London News*, 1st Oct. 1949; O. R. Sellers, in *Biblical Archæologist*, xii. [1949], 55.

[4] Cf. *Revue Biblique*, lvi. [1949], 595.

[5] Cf. *Le Monde*, 9th April 1952.

[6] Cf. *Hibbert Journal*, xlix. [1950–51], 29.

[7] Cf. *The Hebrew Scrolls* [1951], 17.

[8] Cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. xxxix. [1948–49], 235 ff., 337 ff.; xl. [1949–50], 57 ff.; xli. [1950–51], 1 ff., 251 ff.; xlii. [1951–52], 133 ff.; *Crozer Quarterly*, xxvi. [1950], 35 ff.

[9] Cf. *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. xli. [1950–51], 125 ff.

[10] Notably S. A. Birnbaum in a series of publications. Cf. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 113 [Feb. 1949], 33 ff., No. 115 [Oct. 1949], 20 ff., No. 118 [April 1950], 20 ff.; *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 1949, p. 140 ff.; *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxviii. [1949], 161 ff., lxx. [1951], 227 ff.; *Vetus Testamentum*, i. [1951], 91 ff.

[11] Cf. especially *The Hebrew Scrolls*, 30 ff.

[12] Cf. M. Burrows, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 122 [April 1951], 4.

[13] Cf. Letter to *The Times*, 23rd Aug. 1949.

[14] Cf. *The Manchester Guardian*, 30th Jan. 1951; O. R. Sellers, in *Biblical Archæologist*, xiv. [1951], 29.

[15] C. M. C. M'Burney states inaccurately that it was made with parchment. Cf. *Antiquity*, xxvi. [1952], 35 ff.

was made.[1] Hence none of these arguments is conclusive. Nevertheless they cannot be dismissed. They have a cumulative weight greater than the individual weight of any, and together they do establish some limits of probability.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the jars are of late Hellenistic type, even though it must now be recognized that such jars may have continued to be made in Palestine for some time after the Roman age began. It is possible that jars may have remained in use for a long time after they were made. But the cave of 'Ain Feshkha once contained about forty jars, of a common type though not of a single pattern. It is improbable that so large a collection of late Hellenistic jars would have been brought together centuries later than the beginning of the Roman period. This consideration is reinforced by the results of the radiocarbon test, which is in substantial agreement here though when taken alone it is not conclusive. Similarly the palæographical argument brings its support. For while it is impossible to date the manuscripts with precision, it is possible to say that they are not likely to have been written later than the early Christian centuries. In every discussion of the palæography the Nash papyrus figures heavily. When it was first discovered it was attributed to the first, or possibly the early second, century A.D.[2] Scarcely any one looked to a later date.[3] Ten years before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls Professor Albright argued for a date in the Maccabæan age in the second century B.C.[4] More recently he has been prepared to come down to the first century B.C.[5] While its age is still debatable, therefore, the debate is confined within a moderate range. In the Nash Papyrus all the final letters are used. But in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls only some of the final letters are used, and these in a fluid way. It may be allowed that it probably took the final letters some time to get established, and one writer could employ them all while contemporary writers did not, but it is improbable that the period of fluid use continued for an indefinite time.

All of these considerations taken together make it improbable that the deposit in the cave was later than A.D. 250, and leave open the possibility that it was a good deal earlier. They still leave open the issues with which we began, though they have narrowed the margins to a considerable extent.

It must, nevertheless, be recognized that the scholars who argued for a late date have made important contributions to the discussion on the Scrolls. Their critical caution in the face of the exaggerated claims that have been made for palæography has served the cause of scholarship. Moreover, the links of thought and of language between some of our texts and the writings of the Ḳaraites, to which they have drawn attention, demand consideration. The Ḳaraites first began as a body of Jews opposing the Rabbanate in the eighth century A.D., though they claimed that they stood in an ancient tradition. If the Dead Sea Scrolls had been buried since before the beginning of the Christian era, and had remained buried until 1947, how could these links be explained ? Moreover, it has been noted that the *Zadokite Work* and the Dead Sea Scrolls come from the same sect. Yet the Zadokite Fragments were found in the Ḳaraite Genizah of Cairo half a century ago. Happily a probable answer to this problem has been found. For soon after the discovery of the Scrolls became known Professor Eissfeldt [6] recalled a letter of the Nestorian Patriarch Timotheus,[7] telling of the discovery of a cave near the Dead Sea about A.D. 800 containg a number of Hebrew manuscripts. Then Father de Vaux [8] adduced further information from Ḳaraite sources about a Cave Sect, which was given this name because its writings were found in a cave. While little is known of the teaching of this Cave Sect, it would appear to have shared some of the ideas of the Sect of the Scrolls. Too little is known to identify them with security, however. If the cave mentioned by Timotheus were the cave of 'Ain Feshkha, or some neighbouring cave in which

[1] Cf. G. E. Wright, in *Biblical Archæologist*, xiv. [1951], 31 ff., where it is stated that the test was carried out on three samples from a single piece of wood, yielding widely different results. The mean date in one case differed by nearly five hundred years from that in the third. On this method of testing, cf. E. S. Deevey, in *The Scientific American*, Feb. 1952, p. 24b. : ' In general the method has fulfilled its original promise. In detail, however, there are puzzles, contradictions and weaknesses. It will be a long time before radiocarbon dating is as straightforward as an electric dishwasher.'

[2] Cf. F. C. Burkitt, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, xv. [1903], 392 ff., xvi. [1904], 559 ff. ; S. A. Cook, in *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, xxv. [1903], 34 ff. ; The Exository Times, xiv. [1902–03], 200 ff. ; I. Lévi, in *Revue des Etudes Juives*, xlvi. [1903], 212 ff. ; X, in *Revue Biblique*, N.S. i. [1904], 242 ff.

[3] G. Margoliouth, however, assigned it to the sixth or seventh century A.D. ; cf. *Jewish Encyclopedia*, viii. [1904], 304b. 312b.

[4] Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lvi. [1937], 145 ff.

[5] Cf. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 113 [Feb. 1949], 18 n., 23 n., No. 115 [Oct. 1949], 19.

[6] Cf. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, lxxiv. [1949], 597 ff.

[7] Cf. O. Braun, *Oriens Christianus*, i. [1901], 299 ff.

[8] Cf. *Revue Biblique*, lvii. [1950], 421 ff.

writings of the same sect were placed, and if the texts found about A.D. 800 fell into the hands of Ḳaraites, we should have a possible explanation of all these facts. It must be remembered that there is evidence that the cave once contained many times as many manuscripts as were found in 1947, and that the broken pottery bore evidence of having been long broken.[1] If the texts then found were from our sect and became Ḳaraite property we could understand the links of word and thought, and could also understand how it came about that the Zadokite Fragments were found in a Ḳaraite Genizah. For the manuscripts found in Cairo were mediæval copies, many centuries younger than the Dead Sea Scrolls, and they could well have been copies of texts referred to in the letter of Timotheus. While this is only a hypothesis, it certainly offers a possible explanation of the facts to which attention has been called, and in the opinion of so eminent a scholar as Professor Kahle it has seemed to offer a probable explanation.[2]

When we try to identify the historical background reflected in the texts, we find many new problems, to which the most diverse answers have been given. It is not possible to examine these here, where space will only allow the presentation of a single view and some of the evidence which supports it.[3] Here we begin with the chronological information given in the *Zadokite Work*. There we read that three hundred and ninety years after the time of Nebuchadnezzar there appeared a shoot from the root of Aaron and Israel. Since Aaron and Israel is a designation of the sect, this would seem to indicate the origin of this group of people within the bosom of Judaism. It is impossible to place any reliance on the chronology since in no ancient Jewish work do we find accurate chronology of the Persian period. We are told that twenty years after this shooting of the root the Teacher of Righteousness arose, and within forty years of his death the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel was expected to take place. Clearly the *Zadokite Work* was written before the expiry of the forty years, but probably near the end of that period. Before it was written the members of the sect had migrated to Damascus. Between the rise of the sect and the migration to Damascus, therefore, lay a period of little more than half a century, plus the unspecified duration of the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness. This is a relatively short period, and it is probable that a sect would have an accurate tradition of its own history over such a period. Hence while the chronology between the time of Nebuchadnezzar and the origin of the sect cannot be relied on, the rest of this chronology has much greater weight.

In the *Habakkuk Commentary* found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls the Teacher of Righteousness again figures, and this text would appear to have been composed soon after his death and to reflect a time earlier than that of the *Zadokite Work*. The enemies of the sect included the Kittim and a Wicked Priest. Several scholars have maintained that the Kittim are here the Romans, and it is undeniable that the term could be so interpreted. In another of the texts, called by Professor Sukenik *The War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, and still but partially published, there are references to the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim of Egypt, the former being linked with Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites and Philistines as the enemies of the sect. Here the conclusion is almost irresistible that we are in the pre-Roman period, and the reference is to the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. It would appear to be after the battle of Paneion, when Palestine passed into Seleucid hands, since the Kittim of Assyria are specified as the active enemies of the sect.

Amongst the teachings of the sect, which we learn in part from the texts which have been mentioned and in part from the *Manual of Discipline*, we find some elements which have led many scholars to think of the Essenes, and while some differences have been recognized the similarities cannot be denied. Our knowledge of the Essenes from other sources comes from the first century A.D., though there is evidence that the sect went back to the second century B.C. It is therefore likely that here we have the Essenes in an earlier stage of their history than that reflected in other sources, or possibly an earlier zealot group out of which the Essenes and perhaps others developed. The sect was particular about Sabbath observance, strongly condemned idolatry, and also objected to polygamy and marriage with a niece. All of these teachings would seem to have been given to the sect by the Teacher of Righteousness, and it is probable that they were living issues in the days of the Teacher of Righteousness. We know from the *Habakkuk Commentary* that he lived in stormy times and suffered persecution and perhaps martyrdom. His characteristic teachings were therefore likely to arise from the situation of the moment.

If we look for a time between 200 B.C. and the

[1] Cf. O. R. Sellers, in *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, No. 114 [April 1949], 8; G. Lankester Harding, in *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*, 1949, p. 114; R. de Vaux, in *La Vie Intellectuelle* [June 1949], 586.

[2] Cf. *Vetus Testamentum*, i. [1951], 44 ff.

[3] Elsewhere the present writer has briefly examined a number of the alternative views. Cf. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, xxviii. [1952], and *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (in the press).

Roman period which could provide a known suitable background for all this, it is hard to think of one more suitable than the Maccabæan age. That Sabbath observance was then an issue we know from the fact that some devotees of the Law suffered themselves to be slain without resistance on the Sabbath day.[1] That the question of idolatry was to the fore needs no demonstration, and references to the pollution of the sanctuary could find no more appropriate setting than the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. To the question of marriage with a niece we must return.

The Wicked Priest has been located in the time of Alexander Jannaeus [2] or in the middle of the first century B.C.,[3] but with even more suitability he can be located in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The members of the sect are called the Sons of Zadok. Here it is almost certain that the Zadok who lived in the time of David and Solomon is meant, for David's polygamy is excused on the ground that it took place before the restoration of the Law by Zadok.[4] The sect therefore appears to have supported the High Priestly line of Zadok. In the Maccabæan age, a few years before the rising, Onias the High Priest was replaced first by his brother Jason and then by one Menelaus, who seems not to have been even of the tribe of Levi.[5] The question of the true succession to the High Priesthood was therefore a live one at this time, when the supporters of Onias might well call themselves the Sons of Zadok. Later in the century this became an issue once more. For the Hasmonæans assumed the office, though they were not of the true descent, and we know from the fate of Eleazar, who advised John Hyrcanus to be content with the civil office and to renounce the priestly office, that this was an important issue then.[6] Taken by itself, therefore, this clue can give us little guidance.

It is to be observed, however, that the Wicked Priest was contemporary with a Man of Scorn, who poured out words of untruth to Israel and who rejected the Law among all peoples.[7] Moreover, the Wicked Priest would seem from the references in the *Habakkuk Commentary* to be associated with the Kittim. It is very improbable that the Man of Scorn is to be identified with the Wicked Priest, since of no Jewish priest of this period could it be understandably said that he rejected the Law among all peoples. It is, therefore, probable that the Man of Scorn is one of the foreign enemies of the sect, and one of the Kittim. If he should be identified with the Chief of the kings of Javan, mentioned in the *Zadokite Work*, we should have to look amongst the Hellenistic kings for him. Here, once more, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes would offer the most likely time. There were many times during the second century B.C. when Hasmonæan priests were allied with one or other of the rival rulers of the Seleucid kingdom, but at such times the Seleucids were not oppressively active in Palestine in the way indicated in the *Habakkuk Commentary*. Nor can any of the Seleucid rulers, or claimants to power, be reasonably described as pouring out words of Untruth to Israel and rejecting the Law among all peoples, save only Antiochus Epiphanes. In this time there was violent persecution throughout the land, carried out by the officers of the king, who was supported by a subservient but illegitimate High Priest. Of Antiochus we are told in 1 Maccabees that he issued orders throughout his whole kingdom that all people should forsake their own laws.[8] Whether that is historically true is of no moment here. It is evidence that the Jews credited him with such action, and therefore such a statement as we have in the *Zadokite Work* could well have been made about him by another Jew.

If we tentatively accept these indications as pointing to the Maccabæan age, we may identify the Teacher of Righteousness with Onias, whose followers called themselves the Sons of Zadok.

[1] Cf. 1 Macc ii. 32 ff.

[2] Cf. M. H. Segal, in *The Jerusalem Post*, 26th May and 2nd June, 1950; *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxx. [1951], 131 ff.; R. de Vaux, in *Revue Biblique*, lvii. [1950], 428 f.; M. Delcor, *ib.*, lviii. [1951], 538 ff., and *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* [1951], 56 ff.

[3] Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc* [1950], *Aperçus préliminaires* [1950], and *Observations sur le Manuel de Discipline* [1951]; R. Goossens, in *La Nouvelle Clio*, i.-ii. [1949–50], 336 ff., 652, 662 ff., and *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles*, iii. [1950–51], 399 ff.; H. Grégoire, in *La Nouvelle Clio*, i.-ii. 354 ff.; M. Simon, in *Revue Historique* [Oct.–Dec. 1950], 218 ff.

[4] Cf. *Zadokite Work*, vii. 6 (page v., lines 4 f.).

[5] Cf. 2 Macc iv. 23, iii. 4. According to Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. v. 1 (xii. 238), Menelaus was the brother of Onias. This view is followed by S. Zeitlin, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. xli. [1950–51], 258, while R. Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb edition), vii. [1943], 121 n., pronounced Josephus confused here. Several writers have held that Menelaus belonged to the priestly family of Bilgah (cf. Neh $12^{5.\ 18}$). So H. Bévénot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* [1931], 181; E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer* [1937], 66; F.-M. Abel, *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, i. [1946], 52 ff., and *Les Livres des Maccabées* [1949], 316 f. L. Finkelstein, in *Harvard Theological Review*, xxxvi. [1943], 33 f., rejects this view, and most scholars accept the statement of 2 Maccabees.

[6] Cf. *Antiquities*, XIII. x. 5 f. (xiii. 288 ff.).

[7] Cf. *Zadokite Work*, i. 10 (page i., lines 14 f.); *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. v. lines 11 f.

[8] Cf. 1 Macc i. 41 f.

Another name by which they go is Aaron and Israel, which would seem to indicate that they consisted of priests and laity, and we know from various texts that they were divided into priests, Levites, laity, and proselytes—the last being proselytes to the sect from amongst the Jews, rather than proselytes to Judaism from the Gentiles. The Wicked Priest can with most probability be identified with Menelaus, of whom we read that he consented to many sacrileges in Jerusalem, and that he led Antiochus into the Temple when its treasures were carried off.[1] Moreover the death of Onias was due to Menelaus.[2] It has been noted above that the death of the Teacher of Righteousness was believed by the sect to be an important date, and the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel—the Messiah who should arise from within the sect—was placed at forty years after his death. If the common view of writers of various schools that Dn 9^{26} refers to the death of Onias is correct, his death was believed to mark a similarly important point in history. That Daniel placed his death much nearer the climax of history than the *Zadokite Work* is not surprising if the latter was written after the hope of the former had failed to be realized.

In the *Habakkuk Commentary* there is reference to the House of Absalom.[3] It is probable that this is a title, like the title of the Teacher of Righteousness, and that it does not refer to one actually named Absalom. It would then represent a house which forgot the ties of natural kinship and proved disloyal to those who had a claim to its help. It is condemned because it did not come to the help of the Teacher of Righteousness. Here it is probable, as the Swedish scholar Bo Reicke first pointed out,[4] that the Tobiad house is referred to. It will be remembered that before the transfer of Palestine to the Seleucid rule, Joseph, who was at the head of the Tobiad house, secured the tax-farming rights which had previously belonged to the High Priests.[5] Yet Joseph was related to Onias.[6] After the transfer of Palestine to the Seleucids the Tobiads quickly transferred their allegiance and confirmed their position and influence. When Onias was displaced from office, and when later Menelaus was appointed to it, the Tobiad house might have exercised its influence on behalf of Onias. Their unwillingness to raise a finger could well have brought down upon them this stigma of being dubbed 'House of Absalom' by the members of the sect.

In this connexion it may be noted that the condemnation of polygamy and marriage with a niece finds a relevant setting. For Josephus relates how Joseph married his niece under the most discreditable of circumstances, after first satisfying his lust at her expense with the consent of her father.[7] It would seem that Joseph's wife was still alive, and from her he had had a large family of sons. His new marriage was, therefore, a polygamous one, as well as being of the kind condemned by the sect. Such a marriage with a niece is not directly prohibited in the Pentateuch, and some Pharisees even thought such a union was particularly praiseworthy [8]—though of course not under the disgraceful circumstances of Joseph's case. But the sect—like the Karaites later [9]—based itself on the principle of analogy, and argued that since the Law condemned marriage with an aunt, so marriage with an uncle must be equally condemned. It could easily be understood how a sect that followed Onias could let this incident of Joseph's history be turned to discredit marriage with a niece, and also polygamy.

The text known as the *War of the Sons of Light* is more probably a ritual of war than a description of an actual war, though it doubtless had a period of war as its setting. That this could well be in the Maccabæan period does not need to be argued. The inscriptions on the banners recall the similar inscriptions on the banners of the army of Judas,[10] and the hymns which are prescribed for the return of the victorious army recall the hymns which the armies of Judas are said to have sung.[11] It has been argued that the beasts referred to in the *Habakkuk Commentary* are the elephants of the armies of the Seleucids,[12] and also that the ritual of war reflects the military dispositions of the Hellenistic armies of the second century B.C.[13] While these considerations, taken alone, might not be given much weight, they bring a measure of supporting weight to the general picture, with which they are wholly consistent.

It therefore seems probable that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be set in the Maccabæan age, and that his death took place in 171 B.C. The

[1] Cf. 2 Macc v. 23 ff. [2] Cf. 2 Macc iv. 32 ff.

[3] Cf. *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. v., lines 9 ff.

[4] Cf. *Studia Theologica*, ii. [1949–50], 57 f.

[5] Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. iv. 1 ff. (xii. 154ff.). Cf. M. Holleaux, in *Etudes d'Epigraphie et d'Histoire grecques*, iii. [1942], 337 ff.

[6] Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII. iv. 2 (xii. 160).

[7] Cf. *ib.*, XII. iv. 6 (xii. 186 ff.).

[8] Cf. S. Krauss, in *Studies in Jewish Literature* (*Kaufmann Kohler Festschrift*) [1913], 165.

[9] Cf. S. Poznánski, *ib.*, 245 ff.

[10] Cf. 2 Macc viii. 23, xiii. 15.

[11] Cf. 1 Macc iv. 24.

[12] Cf. E. Stauffer, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, lxxvi. [1951], 667 ff.

[13] Cf. J.-G. Février, in *Semitica*, iii. [1950], 53 ff.; M. Avi-Yonah, in *Israel Exploration Journal*, ii. [1952], 1 ff.

migration to Damascus would then have taken place at some time before 131 B.C., since the coming of the Messiah was expected forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. The composition of the *Zadokite Work* would have to be placed before 131 B.C., but probably not much before, while the composition of the *Habakkuk Commentary*, the *War of the Sons of Light*, the *Hymns of Praise*, and the *Manual of Discipline* would all lie earlier than the *Zadokite Work*. In the last-named work there is reference to the Book of *Jubilees*, which should most probably be ascribed to the middle of the second century B.C.[1] This would, therefore, again accord with the view here presented. The sect was interested in calendar questions,[2] and we know from the Book of *Jubilees* that such questions were to the fore in that age,[3] while the Book of Daniel says that the Little Horn, who has long been identified with Antiochus Epiphanes, thought to change times and seasons.[4]

The migration to Damascus would fit well into the time suggested. When the Hasmonæans assumed the High Priesthood, those who passionately supported the claims of the line of Zadok would naturally renew their opposition, and might well find flight prudent, since civil authority was also in Hasmonæan hands. It has been noted that the flight must have taken place at a time when Damascus and Jerusalem were controlled by unfriendly powers. When the Hasmonæans supported now one and now another of the various claimants for the power in Syria there must have been times when Damascus and Jerusalem were on opposite sides, and the rulers of Damascus would be willing to give asylum to refugees from Palestine.

It is improbable that the exile was permanent. If the sect consisted of early Essenes, then the fact that Essenes are known to have lived in Palestine in later times would imply that they were able to return, and a sect so strongly Jewish would certainly desire to return as soon as it was possible. In this case the crisis that involved the hiding of the Scrolls was not that which led to the migration to Damascus. For the sect would not hide its library, never to recover it, until it finally disappeared from the neighbourhood. But the Essenes did not so disappear from the vicinity of the Dead Sea until after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Father de Vaux [5] and Professor Dupont-Sommer [6] think the deposit of the manuscripts took place at the time of the Jewish War that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. Before that time Pliny the Elder refers to the Essenes as being in this vicinity,[7] but no later writer mentions them as being in this neighbourhood. It should be remembered, however, that after the Jewish War Josephus refers to the Essenes as a sect of the Jews,[8] and if they had recently suffered a major disaster which brought their existence in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea to an end he might have been expected to give some indication of this. For if the Jewish War menaced their life in this district it might be expected to do so equally in any other district of Palestine where they might be living. It is therefore likely that the Essenes did not cease to exist here until at least the beginning of the second century, and the time of Bar Cochba would seem to be more likely.

If the composition of the earliest of the non-Biblical works is assigned to the Maccabæan age and the deposit in the cave in the time of Bar-Cochba, ample time would lie between these two dates for the copying of the various manuscripts, Biblical and non-Biblical, as well as for their use over a long period, and particularly for the long use and repair of the Isaiah manuscript. While the present writer would agree with Professor Driver in rejecting the claim that the texts can be closely dated on palæographical grounds, the limits here allowed would fall well within those indicated above as reasonably probable. They also accord with the results of the radiocarbon test, though again the present writer regards this as a supporting rather than as a decisive test.

It is possible that when all the texts are published fuller knowledge may require some modification of this view, which can only at this stage be tentative. Nevertheless it appears to fit the evidence so far known more fully than any of the other views.

[1] Cf. the present writer's *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed. [1947], 84 ff., and *Jewish Quarterly Review*, N.S. xxxvi. [1945–46], 184 ff.

[2] Cf. S. Talmon, in *Biblica*, xxxii. [1951], 549 ff.

[3] Cf. Jubilees, vi. 17 ff., xvi. 20 ff., xxiii. 9, xxxiv. 18 ff., xlix. 1 ff.

[4] Cf. Dn 7^{25}.

[5] Cf. *The Manchester Guardian*, 7th April 1952, and *Le Monde*, 9th April 1952.

[6] Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, 44, 105 (Eng. Tr., 32, 85).

[7] Cf. *Hist. Nat.*, V. xvii. (in Loeb ed., V. xv. 73).

[8] Cf. *Wars*, II. viii. 2 ff. (ii. 119 ff.); *Antiquities*, XVIII. i. 5 (xviii. 18 ff.)

Philo and the Fourth Gospel

By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Oxford

It is not customary nowadays to interpret the Fourth Gospel in the light of the writings of Philo. The climate of theological opinion has changed since the time when such writers as Dr. Inge taught us to regard the Logos of St. John as the Logos of Philo, baptized into the Christian faith. Yet it may be wondered whether any fully satisfactory alternative interpretation has been found. It has been said with truth that the opening of the first chapter of the Fourth Gospel recalls the opening of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis; but it cannot seriously be maintained that St. John's use of the term Logos is fully explained as a reference to the spoken word of God in His work of creation. The spoken word of Yahweh is never personified in Hebrew thought, as the Logos of John is personified. Again, it has been truly pointed out that the Logos doctrine of John owes much to the conception of the wisdom of God, especially in the Book of Wisdom; but this fact does not disprove the connexion between the Logos of John and the Logos of Philo; for Philo drew much of the inspiration for his Logos doctrine from the Book of Wisdom as well as from Platonic and Stoic thought. It has been noticed, further, that the author of the Fourth Gospel is probably indebted to the Testament of Levi for his phrase 'the true Light that lighteth every man' (Jn 1^{9}). The Testament of Levi (14^{4}) speaks of 'the light of the law which was given to light every man.' But if John is quoting this verse, he is quoting it in order to correct it. Whereas for the Testament of Levi the Torah is the true light that lighteth every man, for John (as for Philo) it is the Logos who is the true light (cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* iii. 14, 15, 34, 56; *de Migrat. Abr.* 8). 'The law was given through Moses,' says John, 'but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ' (1^{17}). Jesus, the Logos, is greater than the Torah, and more worthy to be called 'the Light of the world' (8^{12} 9^{5} $12^{35.36.46}$).

When one studies closely the Logos doctrine of Philo one cannot fail to be struck by the many resemblances of expression between Philo and the Fourth Gospel. 'In the beginning was the Logos,' says the Fourth Evangelist (1^{1}). For Philo not only was the Logos in the beginning, being eternal (*Conf. Ling.* 28; *de Plantat. Noe*, 5; etc.), but one of his many names is 'the beginning' (ἀρχή, *Conf. Ling.* 28). For John the Logos is God's Agent in creation (1^{3}); for Philo the Logos is God's instrument (ὄργανον) in creation (*Cherub.* 35; *de Sacr. Ab. et Caini*, 3; *Quod Deus immut.* 12). Elsewhere, without any real inconsistency, Philo writes: 'Neither before creation was anything with God (σὺν τῷ Θεῷ) nor since the creation of the cosmos is anything ranked with him' (*Leg. All.* ii. 1). God in determining to create 'used no assistant (or advocate, παρακλήτῳ)—for who was there?—but himself alone' (*de Mundi. Op.* 6). Philo does not here deny the agency of the Logos, which in these passages must be taken as included in the Godhead. But the author of the Fourth Gospel, lest there be misunderstanding, appears to be deliberately correcting Philo's language in this regard when he writes: 'He was in the beginning with God (πρὸς τὸν Θεόν). Everything was made through him, and without him was not anything made that was made' (Jn 1^{2-3}).

For John (1^{4}), as for Philo (for example, *Leg. All.* iii. 25–26; *de Plantat. Noe*, 9), the Logos is the source of life and light. Again, Jn 1^{12}: 'But as many as received him (*i.e.*, the Logos), to them gave he the right (ἐξουσίαν) to become the children of God,' appears to echo Philo, *Conf. Ling.* 28: 'But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a son of God, let him be eager to be ranked on the side of His first-born, the Logos. . . . If we have not yet become fit to be considered children of God, at least we are children of His eternal image, the most sacred Logos.' But Philo could not have said, as John does (1^{14}) 'The Logos became flesh.' In baptizing the Philonian Logos into the Christian faith, the Fourth Evangelist has transformed the significance of the term.

The first chapter of John's Gospel introduces us to other titles of Jesus besides the Logos: Jesus Christ (1^{17}), 'only begotten Divine One who is in the bosom of the Father' (1^{18}), 'the Lamb of God' ($1^{29.36}$), 'Rabbi' (1^{38}), 'Messiah' (1^{41}), 'Son of Joseph, who is from Nazareth' (1^{45}), 'Son of God' 'King of Israel' (1^{49}); and finally Jesus calls Himself 'The Son of Man' (1^{51}), in a reference to Jacob's dream of the ladder set up between heaven and earth (Gn 28^{12}). Jacob's dream of the ladder figures prominently in the Philonic Logos doctrine. In the course of a long allegorical interpretation, the angels ascending and descending on it are said by Philo to represent Logoi, and the place itself, where Jacob had the dream, is said to typify the Logos (*de Somn.* i. 11; cf. *de Migrat. Abr.* 1). If John has this Philonic allegory in mind, then his first chapter ends, as it begins, with the

Logos, and the Prologue is not concluded till the end of the first chapter. Moreover, it will follow that the Logos has been identified by John with the Son of Man, just as Philo's Logos is the heavenly archetypal Man (*Leg. All.* i. 12, 31; *de Mundi Op.* 46; *de Plantat. Noe*, 5). No less than the Son of Man of the Similitudes of Enoch, Philo's Logos is divine and heavenly Man.

The evidence appears to bear out the suggestion made by J. M. Creed in *J. Th. S.*, xxvi. 134; 'At first sight it would appear as if the belief in Jesus as heavenly Son of Man might readily blend with a Logos Christology, and indeed it is possible that an interpretation of the term Son of Man on these lines was not absent from the mind of the fourth evangelist. He alone of the evangelists brings out the pre-existence of Him who is called Son of Man. "No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man" (Jn 3^{13}). It would seem, therefore, that the fourth evangelist was prepared, like Philo, to identify the heavenly Man with the Logos, and perhaps to suggest that the Logos was archetypal Man.'

After the first chapter of St. John's Gospel the terms Son of Man and Son of God replace the Logos, but the Logos conception remains. In Jn 3^{14} the Son of Man is compared with the Brazen Serpent of Nu 21^{8-9}: 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, in order that every one who believes in him may have eternal life' (cf. 8^{28} $12^{32f.}$). Philo, too, in *Leg. All.* ii. 20f., links the Logos with the Brazen Serpent, which for him typifies the Logos of temperance (σωφροσύνη). Philo appears to intend a connexion between the Brazen Serpent and the Logos; but as he is contrasting the Brazen Serpent with the noxious serpent (pleasure, ἡδονή), he limits the connexion between the Brazen Serpent and the Logos to one of the four cardinal virtues (*Logoi*) which are comprised by the Logos. Similarly John links the Son of Man with the Manna, the bread from heaven ($6^{35f.\ 53f.}$), just as Philo declares that the Divine Logoi are the manna, the heavenly food, by which man may be nourished (*de congr. erud. gr.* 30; *de Prof.* 25).

In Jn 8^{56} Jesus says: 'Abraham, your father, rejoiced that he might see my day, and he saw it, and was glad.' In Philo (*de Migrat. Abr.* 31) the visit of the angels to Abraham is explained as a visit of the Logoi or the Logos. In Jn 7^{38} Jesus speaks of Himself as the source of rivers of water. In Philo the Logos is symbolized by the river that flows out of Eden (*Post. Cain.*, 36, 37, 41, 45), and by the river of God which is full of water (Ps 65^{9}), and by the river which makes glad the city of God (Ps 46^{4}), that is, which makes glad the soul of man, in which God is said to walk as in a city (*Somn.* ii. 37).

Philo's Logos is the Image of God and Mediator between God and man, revealing God to man and leading man to God (*Conf. Ling.* 28; *Quod Deus immut.* 30; *Quis rer. div. her.* 42). Similarly the Johannine Logos is the 'exegete' of the Father (1^{18}) who proclaims: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' (14^{9}; cf. 12^{45}), and 'No one cometh unto the Father, but by me' (14^{6}). Philo's Logos is 'the King's Way' (*Post. Cain.*, 102). The Johannine Logos declares: 'I am the way' (14^{6}). As Philo's Logos is Divine, yet subordinate to the Father (*Frag.* ii. 625, answering to *Qu. et sol.* in Gn 2^{62}), so the Johannine Logos can say both 'I and the Father are one' (10^{30}) and 'The Father is greater than I' (14^{28}).

So many resemblances and parallels cannot all be attributed to coincidence. Their cumulative force suggests that to deny any connexion between the Johannine Logos conception and that of Philo would be to throw away a valuable clue to the understanding of the mind and thought of the fourth evangelist.[1]

[1] Cf. J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums* [1902], 106 f.

Entre Nous

Worship in the Day School: 2. The Material of Worship

The very act of praying assumes without argument certain truths about God. It assumes, to begin with, that God exists; it also assumes that He is in touch with us, able to hear our petitions, and in a position to do something about them. So the very simplest beginning of prayer, 'O God . . .', assumes a whole body of theological truth. If I go further and say, 'Almighty God . . .', or further still and say, 'Almighty Father, who hast given thine only Son to die for our sins and to rise again for our justification . . .', then the implicit theological truth is obviously becoming more and more pronounced. In fact I cannot say the two words 'Our Father . . .' or finish a prayer with the formula, '. . . through Jesus Christ our Lord', without finding myself challenged by dogmatic assertions about God and the world at large which an atheist or an agnostic is perfectly free to dispute.

This illustrates an important fact about worship —that any act of worship, from the simplest grace before meat to the most elaborate liturgical rite, is an implicit confession of faith. The very words with which we address God also describe God's attributes, and it is because in worship these attributes of God are simply taken for granted, and not argued or deliberately taught, that worship is the most powerful medium for communicating dogmatic truth. It is far more powerful than the direct instruction of the class-room, because it teaches incidentally and by implication; and it is the things that are taken for granted, the implicit assumptions, rather than any kind of explicit teaching, that sink deeply into the subconscious mind and become the basis of 'faith.' For this reason we need to take the greatest possible care with our worship. It is all the time teaching at a deeper and more enduring level than the 'Scripture lesson' can ever hope to do.

False theology in the classroom is regrettable, but not always very serious. Children will question false theology as well as true. But false theology in worship (where it is unquestioned) is disastrous; because it is through the unargued assumptions of hymns and prayers (not to mention stained-glass windows, illustrated manuals of devotion, and the general behaviour of grown-up people) that children grow in their knowledge of God and of the practice of religion. When we consider that, for most children in our schools, the morning assembly is their only formal contact with God and their only training in prayer (competing on unequal terms with all the other influences on their lives in which the basic assumptions are godless) it is clearly urgent that the worship to which we accustom them should be thoroughly sound, both theologically and devotionally.

A great deal of school worship is defective in these two aspects. There are far too many books provided for use in school assemblies in which the conception of worship is inadequate and sometimes strongly heretical. Theologically, the chief weakness in school worship, specially among juniors, is an undue stress on the beauties of Nature, bordering on pantheism, often with little reference to God at all. The great acts of God in the Incarnation, the Cross, the Resurrection, the Ascension, Pentecost, and the life of the Christian Church, are barely touched upon, if at all. In some books for junior worship 'unpleasant' things (such as illness, pain, wrongdoing—together with the Cross and all references to death and the after life) are deliberately excluded, on the explicit grounds that for young children religion should be a 'joyous' thing; but it can never be a 'joyous' thing in any true sense by leaving unanswered all the most urgent questions that children are capable of asking at a very early age. It will merely misrepresent religion as a spurious delight in natural beauty and will distort the child's growing idea of God. So we should avoid like the plague any hymns or prayers which gloss over the great dogmas of the faith in favour of pantheistic Nature-worship, Pelagian self-sufficiency, or ('These things shall be . . . !') unblushing scientific humanism.

Besides theological soundness, worship must have devotional balance. Remember again that for most of our children the school assembly will be their one experience of prayer and the only instruction they will ever receive in worship. They will learn by doing—implicitly. Therefore we must be careful to let them experience the whole gamut of worship—Adoration, Confession, Thanksgiving, Supplication (in its two forms, Petition for ourselves and Intercession for others), and Self-oblation. Here again, there is a tendency for school worship, specially with juniors, to concentrate largely on Thanksgiving—with perhaps limited forms of Supplication—and to omit altogether the more profound acts of prostrate adoration (in which children delight), simple acts of penitence for wrong-doing and prayers of self-offering and the dedication of work. It is impossible in every act of school worship to range over the whole field of devotion, but we should see that the balance is preserved at least during the course of each week, devoting one morning to Adoration (with other acts subservient), another to Confession, and so on; ensuring that the children will thus become familiar with prayer in all its forms. It adds enormously to the power of this implicit teaching if you assume (and occasionally say so) that the children might like to use this hymn or that prayer when they say their own private prayers night and morning. That can communicate without direct instruction the idea that prayer is a normal part of daily life.

Theological truth and devotional integrity are largely a matter of using good books. Perhaps the two best from this standpoint are *The Oxford Book of School Worship* and *School Worship Day by Day* (both published by the S.P.C.K.).

JOHN G. WILLIAMS

Church of England Schools Council

Modern Education

Some books are not so much *exciting* as they are *excited*. They are written by people on whom some idea has taken hold so that the words seem to bubble forth like a kind of minor volcanic eruption.

Dr. George A. Buttrick has written such a book in *Faith and Education* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press ; $2.00). Dr. Buttrick is certain that modern education is on the wrong lines. To him the universities have become ' bustling cafeterias of information ' instead of ' homes of wisdom.' He would have all education centre and circle round the great commandments, ' Thou shalt love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbour as thyself.'

Dr. Buttrick's contention is that modern education ignores God, and thereby evades the central fact of the whole situation. There is an outlook which glories in a kind of academic detachment and in a suspension of belief. ' We may suspend judgment about the possibility of life on some other planet, or about the cause of the sudden inroad of lamprey eels in Lake Michigan ; but we cannot suspend judgment on whether to steal or to be honest, or on whether man is a mechanism or a soul.' There is an outlook which contends that the only thing that matters is the facts. ' The man who proposes that " our main need is to get at the facts " is a blind and cruel leader, whatever his good intention ; for he might as well be saying, " We shall have a home as soon as we find a lumberyard." ' A fact must have its interpretation. There is in life what George Santayana called ' the brute necessity of believing in something as long as life lasts.' The coolly detached view breaks down whenever it comes up against the strange amalgam of human nature. ' To mend an automobile is relatively simple, if only because the automobile cannot " answer back " ; but to mend the disordered minds or broken hearts of the passengers is another matter.' ' In him (*i.e.*, modern man) there is a cattleyard, a fashion show, a bank teller's cage, a flower garden and a monk's cell.' ' Our slogans reveal the chasms in the modern self. " Don't mix pleasure with business." But why not ? Should they not be mixed ? That chasm has made business a treadmill and pleasure an escape. " Don't mix religion and politics." But, again, why not ? That chasm has made religion a false or unreal piety and politics a morass.' At the centre of all education there must be the great commandment.

Further in education there must be a realism that issues in community. ' The college tends to become a degree mill rather than a comradeship.' Too much of the teaching is irrelevant to life. It is like a farmer's description of a preacher. ' He's like summer lightning ; fills the sky and hits nowhere.' ' The gulf between education and life must be bridged.'

Behind all this there is a sense of failure. The escape is neither in a romantic doctrine of progress nor in a despair which ends in nihilism but in a faith that God will not forsake the works of His own hands.

The sense of destiny must be recaptured. In the face of a life which must end in death ' Education, confronting destiny, must choose between a dull stoicism that sees nothing beyond death, or a romanticism which whistles in the dark a broken tune about the immortality of influence, or an outright Christian faith.' The great guarantee of final triumph is the Resurrection ' which is the sign of a structure of regnant grace over against the uprush of demonism.' The Resurrection cannot be explained away. ' To try to account for this range of fact by speaking of a " vision conjured up by sorrow " or " a woman's hallucination " is as unconvincing as to say of the sunrise, " Some one must have struck a match." ' Real belief must return. ' Modern man has tried the suspense of believing nothing, and because suspense is soon unbearable, he has ended by believing almost anything.' ' Some day soon we must quit our " problem " strategy ; we may find that life is not a " problem " to be solved, but a picture to be painted, or rather, that it is a pilgrimage to a shrine.' So Dr. Buttrick comes almost to the end with the story of the child lost in the unaccustomed streets of a city who told the police, ' If you will take me to the hill where the white cross stands I can find my way.'

This is a book with something to say and a book which says that something with the passionate intensity of a burning belief. We have but one complaint. To print all the notes at the back of the book instead of as footnotes is a nuisance to the reader.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

London University degree examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home, and without interfering with their normal day's work.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors home study becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge.*

LONDON UNIVERSITY B.D., (EXTERNAL) EXAMINATION, 1951:

28

WOLSEY HALL STUDENTS PASSED

including

3 of the 4

FIRST-CLASS HONOURS MEN

PROSPECTUS FREE

Write for Prospectus, mentioning the examination which interests you. You may obtain a copy, without incurring the least obligation, from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 41,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

P. T. FORSYTH
THE MAN AND HIS WORK

W. L. Bradley

The book for which many have been waiting. Dr. Bradley provides an authoritative and brilliant conspectus of Forsyth and his work. He gives us introductions to all the major books and an interesting biographical sketch; from these we are brought into close touch with a personality that is still profoundly influencing Christian thought.

18s. 6d. net

THE PRINCIPLE OF AUTHORITY

P. T. Forsyth

The latest republished title of a theologian whose works are increasingly in demand by all communions of the Christian Church. 'Seek first the Kingdom, the authority of God, and you will find your soul and all else.'

18s. 6d. net

CONGREGATIONALISM
A STUDY IN CHURCH POLITY

Douglas Horton

Sounds a new, strong note of Congregational Churchmanship and indicates that Congregationalism holds the key to the future of the Ecumenical Church.

6s. net

INDEPENDENT PRESS LTD.
MEMORIAL HALL, LONDON, E.C.4

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURES
University of London

NEWMAN ASSOCIATION

Background of Bible Study
Christian Concept of Man
Christian Evidences and Christian Organisation
Equality: The Idea and the Problem
Ethics
Introduction to Psychology
Logic and Epistemology
Philosophy of Science

Prospectus from the Registrar,
31 Portman Square, London, W.1

Telephone: WEL 9958

AUTUMN PUBLICATIONS

THE CROSS OVER INDIA

by Rajaiah D. Paul

A straightforward historical account of the entry of Christianity into India from earliest times to the present day. The author was, until recently, Secretary to the Madras Provincial Government. With a Foreword by Bishop Stephen Neill. 8s 6d net

ON THE MINISTRY

by Stephen Neill

A wise, humane and helpful book for all ordinands, ministers and those who want to know what the ministry of the Church is intended to do and to be. 9s 6d net

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Volume I

by Rudolf Bultmann

The major work of the great Marburg scholar. *November* 25s net

THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

by H. F. D. Sparks

This book, by the Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham, aims at placing the New Testament writings in their historical context and relating them to the *milieu* of religious life and thought in which they were written.

November 13s 6d net

RETURN TO CHRISTIANITY

by Nels Ferré

In this book the Professor of Philosophical Theology at Vanderbilt University considers how the fundamentals of the Christian faith apply to some of the practical problems of today. With a Foreword by Dr. Nathaniel Micklem. 5s net

THE CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

THE CHURCH UNDER COMMUNISM

The two famous Reports on Communism prepared by a Commission of the Church of Scotland. *November probably* 5s net each

MYTH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

by Ian Henderson

7s net

GOD WHO ACTS

Biblical Theology as Recital

by G. Ernest Wright

8s net

The two latest titles in the *Studies in Biblical Theology* series. *October*

SCM PRESS

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post.* *Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 19s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£10, 10s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*